NEW ZION IN BABYLON

The Orthodox Church in the Twentieth Century

PART I. SOWING THE WIND (1901-1917)

Vladimir Moss

Copyright: Vladimir Moss, 2014. All Rights Reserved.

Thou hast perfected the New Zion instead of the old through Thy precious Blood.
Octoechos, Tone 8, Sunday, Mattins, Canon, Canticle Six, Troparion.

If My People had heard Me, if Israel had walked in My ways,
quickly would I have humbled their enemies,
and upon their oppressors would I have laid My hand.
Psalm 80. 12-13

Thus saith the Lord God: Remove the turban, and take off the crown; things shall not remain as they are; exalt that which is low, and abase that which is high. A ruin, ruin, ruin I will make it; there shall not be even a trace of it until he comes whose right it is; and to him I will give it.
Ezekiel 21.26-27.

And unto the angel of the Church in Sardis write:
These things saith He that hath the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars:
I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead.
Be watchful, and strengthen the things that remain, that are ready to die.
For I have not found thy works perfect before God.
Revelation 3.1-2.

Come out from her, My people, lest you share in her sins,
And lest you receive of her plagues.
Revelation 18.4.

[In the Church] one must get to the bottom of the problems, so as to eradicate the sickness from its very root.

St. Basil the Great, Letter 156.

Having no strength in their own teaching, they [the heretics] hunt for it in our weakness, and for this reason, like flies settling on wounds, they settle on our misfortunes – or should I say, mistakes?

St. Gregory the Theologian, Sermon 27, 5.

A want of zeal in small matters is the cause of all our calamities; and because slight errors escape fitting correction, greater ones creep in.

St. John Chrysostom, Homily 1 on Galatians.

Contents

INTRODUCTION 5

1. TSAR NICHOLAS II AND THE COLLECTIVE ANTICHRIST 7

2. THE ORIGINS OF THE ANTICHRIST: (1) COMMUNISM 13

3. THE ORIGINS OF THE ANTICHRIST: (2) ECUMENISM 27

4. RUSSIA AND THE BALKANS 35

5. THE KOSOVAN AND MACEDONIAN QUESTIONS 40

6. THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND "PROTO-ECUMENISM" 52

7. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (1) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS 62

8. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (2) TOLSTOYISM 66

9. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (3) MONASTICISM 68

10. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (4) THE NEW THEOLOGY 72

11. THE SAROV DAYS 75

12. THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR 79

13. THE FALL OF THE REACTIONARIES 84

14. THE APRIL DECREE AND THE OCTOBER MANIFESTO 90

15. THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS 99

16. THE PRE-CONCILIAR CONVENTION 104

17. TURMOIL IN THE WESTERN BORDERLANDS 107

18. GEORGIAN AUTOCEPHALY 115

19. THE BEILIS TRIAL AND THE JEWISH "BLOOD LIBEL" 121

20. RASPUTIN 131

21. THE BALKAN WARS 140

22. THE SALT LOSES ITS SAVOUR 151

23. THE NAME-WORSHIPPING HERESY 155

24. SARAJEVO 160

25. GERMANY AND RUSSIA 165

26. THE WAR AND THE REVOLUTION 170

27. THE PLOT 177

28. THE ABDICATION OF THE TSAR **181**

29. THE CHURCH AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION **187**

30. THREE VISIONS OF 1917 **193**

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this book is the titanic struggle between the Orthodox Church and the Revolution in the twentieth century – both the communist revolution in the East, and the liberal-ecumenist revolution in the West. This struggle has involved hundreds of millions of people on several continents, and produced millions of martyrs. And yet, considered as a whole, it has gone largely unrecorded, at any rate in the English language.[1] There are several reasons for this. One is that the historical documents recording this struggle are to be found mainly in obscure journals written in Russian or Greek that are not accessible to many English-speaking writers. Another is that in order to understand this struggle, since it is a spiritual one, it is necessary to *take part in it*. In other words, this struggle is not a theme for objective historical research in the usual sense: while historical objectivity is necessary, it must be mixed with *faith,* faith in the truth of the Church and her ultimate triumph over falsehood and evil. Thirdly and most seriously, however, to many, even to many Orthodox Christians, it looks as if the struggle has been lost, that "True Orthodoxy", that is, the Orthodoxy which refuses to compromise in any way with the Revolution, has failed in the Darwinian struggle for survival; which must give it, in their imagination, the aspect of a gallant, but essentially vain, even harmful, attempt to hold up the inevitable course of history and progress.

The thought arising in the minds of many that True Orthodoxy has lost the struggle is elicited particularly by its sadly divided state today. And yet it must be remembered that such a situation is by no means unprecedented in Church history. Thus in the fourth century St. Hilary of Poitiers wrote: "Since the Nicene Council, we have done nothing but rewrite creeds. While we fight about words, inquire about novelties, take advantage of ambiguities, criticize authors, fight on party questions, have difficulties in agreeing, and prepare to anathematize each other, there is scarcely a man who belongs to Christ. Take, for example, last year's creed, what alteration is there not in it already? First, we have a creed which bids us not to use the Nicene 'consubstantial'; then comes another, which decrees and preaches it; next, the third excuses the word 'substance', as adopted by the Fathers in their simplicity; lastly, the fourth, which instead of excusing, condemns. We determine creeds by the year or the month, we change our own determinations, we prohibit our changes, we anathematize our prohibitions. Thus, we either condemn others in our own persons, or ourselves in the instance of others, while we bite and devour one another, and are like to be consumed one of another."[2]

---

[1] The present work is a greatly expanded and revised version of *The Orthodox Church at the Crossroads, 1917-1999* (*Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' na pereputie, 1917-1999 gg.*), which was published in Russian in St. Petersburg in 2001 and *Letopis' Velikoj Bitke (Chronicle of a Great Battle,)* published in Serbian in Belgrade in 2006.

[2] St. Hilary, *Ad Const.* ii, 4, 5; quoted by Metropolitan Ephraim of Boston in his "Statement on Grace, March, 2003". St. Hilary's younger contemporary, St. Basil the Great, spoke still more eloquently of the confusion and internecine strife of the Churches in his time (*On the Holy Spirit,* 30).

And yet it is generally acknowledged that the composition of a correct confession of faith is a matter of the very first importance; and this book is written in the firm belief that, however discouraging the present picture, the struggle for the True Faith is not over, and that this struggle is not vain; but that if True Orthodoxy is to triumph again, as the prophecies of the Holy Fathers indicate it will, lessons must be drawn from the history of the hundred years or so that have elapsed since it began – lessons that are drawn in the course of this book.

These lessons are partly dogmatic in nature; for, like previous such struggles in the history of the Church, the struggle between Orthodoxy and the Revolution in the twentieth century has had the good consequence of providing the opportunity, through the necessity of struggling with heresy, of clarifying the Church's teaching – in this case, the Church's teaching on *herself*. For it has revolved around such questions as: In what sense is the Church One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, as the Nicene Creed defines her? Is she truly of Divine origin and nature, or is she a purely human organization? Does she evolve in her teachings and practice, or does she remain the same? What is the nature of her unity? What is her relation to the State and different forms of governmental power? Does she embrace all the vast multitudes who call themselves Christian today, or is she the gathering of a small faithful remnant on earth? Is she truly the only Ark of salvation, or only one of many roads leading to God? By the end of this book, therefore, I hope that clearer answers to these questions will have emerged.

Since this work is confessional as well as historical in nature, I owe much not only to the historical sources I list in the footnotes, but also to my teachers in the faith, the Holy Fathers and Teachers of the Orthodox Church. I also gratefully acknowledge the help I have received from Bishops Photius of Marathon and Ambrose of Methone of the True Orthodox Church of Greece.

I should like to dedicate this work to the hierarch who received me into the Orthodox Church and whose confession of the faith I have tried to emulate – Archbishop Nicodim of Richmond and Great Britain of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad (+1976). May his memory be eternal!

Through the prayers of our Holy Fathers, Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us!

October 13/26, 2014.
Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council.
East House, Beech Hill, Mayford, Woking. GU22 0SB. United Kingdom.

1. TSAR NICHOLAS II AND THE COLLECTIVE ANTICHRIST

In the Orthodox Church in the imperial period of her history – that is, from St. Constantine the Great in the early fourth to Tsar Nicholas II in the early twentieth century, - the Anointed Emperor or Autocrat or Tsar occupied a unique, and uniquely critical role. Although only a layman, the sacred anointing which the Emperor received at his accession gave him, like Kings David and Solomon in the Old Testament, a power and authority not only above all other laymen, but also, in some respects, above even the hierarchs of the Church. The definition of the faith and the administration of the sacraments, including the ordination and deposition of bishops and priests, remained the exclusive preserve of the Church hierarchy. However, it was the Emperor who defended the Church against external enemies, being "the one who restrains" the coming of the Antichrist, in St. Paul's words (II Thessalonians 2.7); it was he who represented the faith to the outside world and encouraged the Church's missionary work (hence he was "the bishop for those outside", in St. Constantine's phrase); and it was he who, in times of dogmatic conflict when the bishops could not come to agreement, had the power to force the bishops to attend Councils at which these conflicts were resolved. Thus the Emperor was both an external shield for the Church and a focus of her internal unity.

The Church had existed without a Christian Emperor in the first centuries of her existence, and she would continue to do so after 1917. Nevertheless, his loss would be felt most acutely and would bring enormous destruction in its wake. Thus "from the day of his abdication," as St. John Maximovich writes, "everything began to collapse. It could not have been otherwise. The one who united everything, who stood guard for the truth, was overthrown…"[3]

Since Tsar Nicholas II has probably been more slandered and misunderstood than any ruler in history, it is necessary to begin with a characterization of him.

"Nicholas Alexandrovich," writes Archpriest Lev Lebedev, "was born on May 6/19, 1868 on the day of the memorial of Job the Much-Suffering. Later he used to say that it was not *by chance* that his reign and his suffering would become much-suffering. In complete accordance with the will of his father, Nicholas Alexandrovich grew up 'as a normal, healthy Russian person'… From childhood he was able first of all 'to pray well to God'. His biographer would unanimously note that faith in God was the living condition of his soul. He did not make a single important decision without fervent prayer! At the same time, being a young man and not yet Tsar, Nicholas Alexandrovich externally lived in the same way that almost all worldly young people of his time and his level of education. He loved sport, games, military activities, and acquired a fashionable for that time habit of smoking. He had an affair with

[3] St. John Maximovich, "Homily before a Memorial Service for the Tsar-Martyr", in *Man of God: Saint John of Shanghai and San Francisco,* Redding, Ca., 1994, p. 133.

the ballerina Kshesinskaya – which, however, he decisively cut short after an open and firm explanation with his father. He read a great deal, both spiritual and scientific and artistic literature (he loved L. Tolstoy's War and Peace), he loved amateur dramatics and various 'shows' in the circle of his family and friends, he was keen on amusing tricks. But all this was *to a degree*, without extremes, and never going to the service of the passions. He had a strong will, and with the help of God and his parents he was able to control and rule himself. In sum, he preserved a wonderful clarity, integrity and purity of soul. The direct gaze of his deep, grey-blue eyes, which often flashed with welcoming humour, penetrated into the very soul of his interlocutors, completely captivating people who had not yet lost the good, but he was unendurable for the evil. Later, when his relations with the Tsar were already hostile, Count S.Yu. Witte wrote: 'I have never met a more educated person in my life than the presently reigning Emperor Nicholas II'. Nicholas Alexandrovich was distinguished by a noble combination of a feeling of dignity with meekness (at times even shyness), extreme delicacy and attentiveness in talking with people. He was sincerely and unhypocritically *simple* in his relations with everybody, from the courtier to the peasant. He was organically repelled by any self-advertisement, loud phrases or put-on poses. He could not endure artificiality, theatricality and the desire 'to make an impression'. He never considered it possible for him to show to any but the very closest people his experiences, sorrows and griefs. It was not cunning, calculated concealment, but precisely humility and the loftiest feeling of personal responsibility before God for his decisions and acts that led him to share his thoughts with almost nobody until they had matured to a point close to decision. Moreover, like his father, he put these decisions into effect in a quiet, unnoticed manner, through his ministers and courtiers, so that it *seemed* as if they were not his decisions… Later only his wife, Tsarina Alexandra Fyodorovna, knew the hidden life of his soul, knew him to the end. But for others, and especially for 'society', Nicholas Alexandrovich, like his crown-bearing forbear, Alexander I, was and remained an *enigma*, 'a sphinx'. It would not have been difficult to decipher this enigma if there had been the desire, if people had looked at his deeds and judged him from them. But 'educated' society did not have this desire (there is almost none even now!). However, there was a great desire to represent him as 'the all-Russian despot', 'the tyrant' in the most unflattering light. And so sometimes spontaneously, at other times *deliberately*, a slanderous, completely distorted image of Tsar Nicholas II was created, in which by no means the least important place was occupied by malicious talk of the 'weakness' of his will, his submission to influences, his 'limitations', 'greyness', etc. One could test the Russian intelligentsia, as if by litmus paper, by their attitude to the personality of Nicholas Alexandrovich. And the testing almost always confirmed the already clearly established truth that in the whole world it was impossible to find a more despicable 'cultural intelligentsia' in its poverty and primitiveness than the Russian!... However, the personality of Nicholas II was not badly seen and understood by those representatives of the West who were *duty-bound* to understand it! The German chargé in Russia, Count Rechs, reported to his government in 1893: '… I consider Emperor Nicholas to be a

spiritually gifted man, with a noble turn of mind, circumspect and tactful. His manners are so meek, and he displays so little *external* decisiveness, that one could easily come to the conclusion that he does not have a strong will, but the people around him assure me that he has a very definite will, which he is able to effect in life in *the quietest* manner.' The report was accurate. Later the West would more than once become convinced that the Tsar had an exceptionally strong will. President Emile Lubet of France witnessed in 1910: 'They say about the Russian Tsar that he is accessible to various influences. This is profoundly untrue. The Russian Emperor himself puts his ideas into effect. His plans are maturely conceived and thoroughly worked out. He works unceasingly on their realization.' Winston Churchill, who knew what he was talking about when it came to rulers, had a very high opinion of the statesmanship abilities of Nicholas II. The Tsar received a very broad higher juridical and military education. His teachers were outstanding university professors, including… C.P. Pobedonostsev and the most eminent generals of the Russian army. Nicholas Alexandrovich took systematic part in State affairs, and was president of various committees (including the Great Siberian railway), sitting in the State Council and the Committee of Ministers. He spoke English, French and German fluently. He had an adequate knowledge of Orthodox theology…"[4]

In an age when family life, especially among the nobility, was being undermined, the family of Tsar Nicholas presented an icon, as it were, of what Christian family life should be. Love, obedience and humility were at the root of all their relations. It was fitting, therefore, that the family as a whole should receive the crown on martyrdom in 1918…

The Tsar was unparalleled in Russian history for his mercifulness. He pardoned criminals, even revolutionaries, and gave away vast quantities of his own land and money to alleviate the plight of the peasants. It is believed that he gave away the last of his personal wealth during the Great War, to support the war effort. Even as a child he often wore patched clothing while spending his personal allowance to help poor students to pay for their tuition.

The reign of the meek and gentle Tsar Nicholas II gave an unparalleled opportunity to tens of millions of people both within and outside the Russian empire to come to a knowledge of the truth and be saved. Moreover, the strength of the Russian Empire protected and sustained Orthodoxy in other parts of the world, such as the Balkans and the Middle East. The Tsar considered it his sacred duty to restore to Russia her ancient traditional culture, which had been abandoned by many of the "educated" classes in favour of modern, Western styles. He encouraged the building of churches and the painting of icons in the traditional Byzantine and Old Russian styles. In the words of Archpriest Michael Polsky, "In the person of the Emperor Nicholas II the believers had the best and most worthy representative of the

[4] Lebedev, *Velikorossia (Great Russia)*, St. Petersburg, 1999, pp. 377-379.

Church, truly 'The Most Pious' as he was referred to in church services. He was a true patron of the Church, and a solicitor of all her blessings."[5]

During the reign of Nicholas II, the Church reached her fullest development and power. "By the outbreak of revolution in 1917… it had between 115 and 125 million adherents (about 70 per cent of the population), around 120,000 priests, deacons and other clergy, 130 bishops, 78,000 churches [up by 10,000], 1,253 monasteries [up by 250], 57 seminaries and four ecclesiastical academies."[6]

The Emperor himself took part in the laying of the first cornerstones and the consecration of many churches. He visited churches and monasteries in all parts of the country, venerating their saints. Moreover, he took a very active part in the glorification of new ones, sometimes urging on an unwilling Holy Synod. Among those glorified during his reign were: St. Theodosius of Chernigov (in 1896), St. Isidore of Yuriev (1897), St. Seraphim of Sarov (1903), St. Euphrosyne of Polotsk (1909), St. Anna of Kashin (1910), St. Joasaph of Belgorod (1911), St. Hermogenes of Moscow (1913), St. Pitirim of Tambov (1914), St. John (Maximovich) of Tobolsk (1916) and St. Paul of Tobolsk (1917).

The Emperor stressed the importance of educating peasant children within the framework of church and parish and, as a result, the number of parish schools, which were more popular among the peasants than the state, zemstvo schools, grew to 37,000. Moreover, Christian literature flourished; excellent journals were published, such as *Soul-Profiting Reading, Soul-Profiting Converser, The Wanderer, The Rudder, The Russian Monk*, *The Trinity Leaflets* and the ever-popular *Russian Pilgrim*. The Russian people were surrounded by spiritual nourishment as never before.

Nor did the Emperor neglect the material condition of his people. Under his leadership Russia made vast strides in economic development. He changed the passport system introduced by Peter I and thus facilitated the free movement of the people, including travel abroad. The poll tax was abolished and a voluntary programme of hospitalisation insurance was introduced, under which, for a payment of one rouble per year, a person was entitled to free hospitalisation. The parity of the rouble was increased greatly on the international markets during his reign. In 1897, a law was enacted to limit work hours; night work was forbidden for women and minors under seventeen years of age, and this at a time when the majority of the countries in the West had almost no labour legislation at all. As William Taft

[5] Polsky, *The New Martyrs of Russia*, Wildwood, Alberta: Monastery Press, 2000, p. 117.

[6] Mikhail V. Shkarovskii, "The Russian Orthodox Church", in Edward Action, Vladimir Cherniaev, William Rosenberg (eds.), *A Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution, 1914-1921*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997, p. 416. On December 1, 1901 the Tsar decreed that every military unit having its own clergy should have its own church in the form of a separate building (A.S. Fedotov, "Khramy vo imia svyatogo blagovernago velikago kniazia Aleksandra Nevskago v XIX-XX vv.", *Pravoslavnaia Rus'*, N 5 (1818), March 1/14, 2007, p. 13).

commented in 1913, "the Russian Emperor has enacted labour legislation which not a single democratic state could boast of".

However, "the greatest of the Tsars" (the words of Blessed Pasha of Sarov) was destined to reign at a time of spiritual decline, even apostasy. In the nineteenth century, many holy men of the Russian Church - Saints Seraphim of Sarov, Philaret of Moscow, Ambrose of Optina and Theophan the Recluse – had prophesied that the end of the world was near. They pointed to the rapid growth of false teachings and immorality, and to the persistent attempts to overthrow "him who restrains" the appearance of the Antichrist - the Orthodox Christian Emperor.

The murder of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 was seen as an especially ominous portent; and as the twentieth century dawned, apocalyptic signs multiplied. Thus in the capital of the greatest remaining pagan empire, Peking, 222 Chinese Orthodox from the Russian Spiritual Mission suffered martyrdom for Christ at the hands of the Boxers. To many, the preaching of the Gospel in the pagan empires of China and Japan, and its first-fruits in the form of the Chinese martyrs, indicated the coming of the end in fulfillment of the Lord's words: "This Gospel of the Kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, *and then the end will come* (Matthew 24.14).[7]

In 1900 the philosopher Vladimir Soloviev had a vision of Christians fleeing into the caves to escape what he called "the collective Antichrist", which he felt was coming soon to Russia. And in his *Three Conversations on the Antichrist* he saw the Antichrist uniting Orthodox, Catholics and Protestants into a single false church. Both presentiments were to be fulfilled after the Russian revolution of 1917…

In general, therefore, the pre-revolutionary period could be described as the period of preparation for the coming of "the collective Antichrist", Soviet power, a last chance for people to repent and come to God before the cataclysm came and swept them all – or almost all - away.

The forerunners of the Antichrist were much in evidence: revolutionaries such as Lenin and Trotsky, freethinkers such as the novelist Lev Tolstoy, theosophists such as Blavatsky, heretics such as the Athonite "name-worshippers", and a huge army of liberals, nihilists, anti-monarchists and ecumenists were busy undermining the foundations of Church and State.

The struggle between the Church and "the collective Antichrist" that was to dominate the twentieth century was clearly foreshadowed, at the beginning of the century, by the struggle between the novelist Lev Tolstoy, "the mirror of the revolution", as Lenin called him, who stood for a Christianity reduced to "pure" morality without the Church, the sacraments or any other other-

[7] "The First Chinese Orthodox Martyrs", *Chinese Herald*, June, 1935; *Orthodox Life*, vol. 29, N 1, January-February, 1979, pp. 14-18; *The True Vine*, N 8, Winter, 1991, pp. 42-51.

worldly element, and the extraordinary priest, St. John of Kronstadt, who demonstrated by his wonderful life abounding in good works and extraordinary miracles, that Christianity "does not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" (I Corinthians 2.5).

There were a few who took the opportunities provided by the relatively peaceful pre-revolutionary period to repent. Among these were Lev Alexandrovich Tikhomirov, who repented of his revolutionary activity to become a prominent champion of the Orthodox monarchy and father of a Catacomb bishop and confessor, and Michael Alexandrovich Novoselov, who repented of his Tolstoyism to become a church publicist and later a Catacomb bishop and martyr. In general, however, it was only after the massive shock of the October revolution that large numbers of people were brought to their senses. In this we can see the special Providence of God, Who draws the greatest good out of the greatest evil. Thus the coming of the collective Antichrist to Russia in the shape of Soviet power was, paradoxically, the means towards the coming to Christ of many previously tepid and heretical Christians.

The world and the devil rose up against the Church in the twentieth century in two main forms: communism and ecumenism. Let us look briefly at each of them.

2. THE ORIGINS OF THE ANTICHRIST: (1) COMMUNISM

Communism is an attempt to substitute the State for the Church, the Party for the Priesthood, History for God, Communism for the Kingdom of God, "revolutionary morality" for Christian morality, class hatred for universal Christian love.

Thus at the beginning of the Red Terror in 1918 the first issue of the Kiev Cheka, *Krasnij Mech* (The Red Sword) declared: "We reject the old systems of morality and 'humanity' invented by the bourgeoisie to oppress and exploit the 'lower classes'. Our morality has no precedent, and our humanity is absolute because it rests on a new ideal. Our aim is to destroy all forms of oppression and violence. To us, everything is permitted, for we are the first to raise the sword not to oppress races and reduce them to slavery, but to liberate humanity from its shackles… Blood? Let blood flow like water! Let blood stain forever the black pirate's flag flown by the bourgeoisie, and let our flag be blood-red forever! For only through the death of the old world can we liberate ourselves from the return of those jackals!"[8]

In view of the fact that communism is by a wide margin the most bloodthirsty movement in human history, it is necessary to say a few words about this aspect of its activity, which cannot be understood, according to Archpriest Lev, without understanding the movement's "devil-worshipping *essence*. For the blood it sheds is always ritualistic, it is a sacrifice to demons. St. John Chrysostom wrote: 'It is a habit among the demons that when men give Divine *worship* to them with the stench and smoke of blood, they, like bloodthirsty and insatiable dogs, *remain in those places* for eating and enjoyment.' It is from such bloody sacrifices that the Satanists receive those demonic *energies* which are so necessary to them in their struggle for power or for the sake of its preservation. It is precisely here that we decipher the enigma: the strange bloodthirstiness of all, without exception all, revolutions, and of the whole of the regime of the Bolsheviks from 1917 to 1953."[9]

That communism, a strictly "scientific" and atheist doctrine, should be compared to devil-worshipping may at first seem strange. And yet closer study of communist history confirms this verdict. The communists' extraordinary hatred of God and Christians, and indeed of mankind in general, can only be explained by demon-possession – more precisely, by an unconscious compulsion to bring blood-sacrifices to the devil, who was, in Christ's words, "a murderer from the beginning" (John 8.44).

Communism, like ecumenism, invaded the Orthodox Church from the Catholic-Protestant West. Its direct ancestors were the Levellers of the English

---

[8] Nicholas Werth, "A State against its People", in Stéphane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panné, Andrzej Packowski, Karel Bartošek, Jean-Louis Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism*, London: Harvard University Press, 1999, p. 102.

[9] Lebedev, op. cit., p. 429.

revolution, and the Jacobins of the French revolution. Dostoyevsky traced its origins even earlier, to Roman Catholicism, seeing in it a logical and emotional development of the secularisation of Christianity first introduced by the Western Church after its falling away from Holy Orthodoxy in the eleventh century.

However, there is a strong case for seeing the roots of communism in a still earlier age and a still earlier apostasy – that of the Jews in the first century, the first rebels against Christ and Christianity…

At this first mentioning of "the Jewish question" in this book, a disclaimer is in order. The perception of a close link between communism, the Jews and Judaism is not a manifestation of "anti-semitism", as the West would have it; for how can a Christian historian who worships a Jewish God, and is a member of the Church founded by exclusively Jewish apostles seriously maintain anti-semitic ideas? It is the product of the simple but basic and incontrovertible fact that the Russian revolution in its initial phase was the work mainly of Jews inspired by a philosophy of history that is in essence Jewish; and that although the leaders of the revolution were against all religion, including Judaism, and although in its later phase they ceased to be predominantly Jewish, they continued to be motivated, consciously or unconsciously, by essentially Jewish ideas. The writer of this work is not anti-semitic, but he is *anti-Judaist* in the sense that he is against the religion of the Talmud, which is fiercely and explicitly anti-Christian in its fundamental beliefs. In this sense all the apostles and fathers and martyrs were, and every consciously believing Orthodox Christian must be – anti-Judaist.

When Abraham left his earthly homeland in search of a promised land in which God alone would be King, world history began a series of violent oscillations between the two poles: Zion and Babylon, the God-Man and the man-god, theocracy and satanocracy. Two thousand years later, the God-Man Himself visited His Kingdom, and a second series of violent oscillations took place. First, the kings of the East came to worship Him – Babylon bowed down before Zion. Then the veil of the temple was rent in twain, – Zion became spiritually Babylon, and in the Babylonian Talmud the Jews worked out the apostate creed of Zionism.

But then the new Israel, "the Israel of God" (Galatians 6.16), the Church of Christ, was born in Zion, and the former children of wrath from the Babylon of the West, the pagan Greeks and Romans, came to bow down at her feet. And when Constantine became king of Old Rome, even the pivot and crown of the Babylonian system, the worship of the god-man-emperor, was transformed into its opposite and the God-fighting satanocracy of Old Rome became the God-loving theocracy of the New Rome.

Now, nearly two thousands years after Christ, we are in the middle of a second great series of violent oscillations in world history. In 1917 the God-loving theocracy of the Third Rome, Russia, was transformed into the God-

hating satanocracy of the Babylon of the North, the Soviet Union. And the apostate Jews took revenge on the Third Rome for the destruction of their State by the First, Old Rome.

It was the Jewish revolt against Rome of 66-70, followed by the destruction of the Temple and the scattering of the apostate Jews over the face of the earth, that sealed the first reversal in the roles of Zion and Babylon. And already we see in it a close resemblance to the second reversal, the one which began in 1917. It is not simply that the Roman emperor can be compared to the Tsar, and the Jewish rebels against Roman power to the Jewish-led revolutionaries who overthrew the tsar: there are also doctrinal similarities.

Thus Neil Faulkner writes: "The revolutionary message of sectarian radicals and messiahs was addressed, above all, to the poor. Josephus was explicit about the class basis of the conflict: it was, for him, a struggle between dunatoi – men of rank and power, the property-owning upper classes – and stasiastai – subversives, revolutionaries, popular leaders whose appeal was to 'the scum of the districts'. The Dead Sea Scrolls were equally explicit, though from the other side of the barricades: whereas 'the princes of Judah… wallowed in the ways of whoredom and wicked wealth' and 'acted arrogantly for the sake of riches and gain', the Lord would in due time deliver them 'into the hands of the poor', so as to 'humble the mighty of the peoples by the hand of those bent to the dust', and bring them 'the reward of the wicked'…

"The popular movement of 66 CE amounted to a fusion of Apocalypse and Jubilee, the radical minority's vision of a revolutionary war to destroy corruption having become inextricably linked with the peasant majority's traditional aspiration for land redistribution and the removal of burdens…"[10]

The main features of the Jewish revolution were resurrected, in Christianized form and using Christian language, in the English revolution of the seventeenth century, and in a still more fearsome and less Christian form (and with the direct participation of the Jews themselves) in the French revolution of 1789. But the English and French revolutions were merely "trial runs", as it were, for the Russian revolution of 1917, which overthrew the primary stronghold of traditional thinking in the whole world, and was not only assisted by, but directly inspired and led by, the Jews. And so just as all the apostate trends of European history from the eleventh century onwards – and of world history from the first century - lead up to, and find their culmination in, the Russian revolution, so all world history since 1917 has evolved from it or in reaction to it, and under its terrible shadow.

That the Russian revolution of 1917 was a resurrection, as it were, of the failed Jewish revolt of 66-70, the age-old determination of the Jews to

[10] Faulkner, "The great Jewish revolt against Rome, 66-73 CE", *History Today*, vol. 52 (10), October, 2002, pp. 50, 51.

overthrow the Gentile rulers and take over world domination from them, was demonstrated by an extraordinary "coincidence" that has been little noted. On November 9, 1917, the London *Times* reported two events in the same column of newsprint: above, the Bolshevik revolution in Petrograd, and immediately below it, the British Foreign Secretary Lord Balfour's promise of a homeland to the Jews in Palestine. To the unbeliever, the two events seem to have no relation to each other; the fact that they happened at exactly the same time, and under the leadership of men from the same race and class and locality – the Jewish intelligentsia of Western Russia and Poland – seems purely coincidental. To the believing eye, however, they are two aspects, in two geographical areas, of one and the same event – the event called in the Gospel "the beginning of sorrows" (Matthew 24.8), in the epistles of St. Paul – "the removal of him that restraineth" (II Thessalonians 2.7), and in the Apocalypse of St. John – "the releasing of the beast from the abyss" (Revelation 20.3).

Looked at from its Jewish aspect, the revolution appears to be the triumph of a purely national and secular movement – Zionism. From the Russian aspect, it looks like a political-social coup motivated by a purely secular vision of world history – Marxism-Leninism. In truth, however, Zionism and Marxism-Leninism are two aspects of a movement which is neither purely nationalist nor political, but religious – or rather, demonic – in essence.

This is most clearly seen in the killing of the Tsar on July 17, 1918. On the wall of his death-chamber was found an inscription which fittingly sums up the deed from the point of view of the Jewish revolution. It was a quotation from the German Jewish poet Heine, slightly altered to bring out the word "tsar" and identifying the tsar with Belshazzar:

Belsatzar ward in selbiger Nacht	*On the same night Belshazzar*
Von seinen knechten umgebracht.	*Was killed by his own slaves.*[11]

But the truth was quite the opposite. Belshazzar hated the people of God, and his removal opened the way for the rebuilding of the Temple of God in Zion by Zerubbabel (which means "alien to Babylon" or "confusion"). The killing of Tsar Nicholas, on the other hand, opened the way to the destruction of Orthodox Russia and its transformation into Babylon.

Such a view was not confined to "anti-Semites". Thus Winston Churchill wrote: "It would almost seem as if the Gospel of Christ and the gospel of anti-Christ were designed to originate among the same people; and that this

[11] See Nicholas Kozlov, *Krestnij Put'*, Moscow, 1993; Enel, "Zhertva" (The Sacrifice), *Kolokol'* (The Bell), Moscow, 1990, N 5, pp. 17-37, and Michael Orlov, "Ekaterinburgskaia Golgofa" (The Yekaterinburg Golgotha), *Kolokol'* (The Bell), 1990, N 5, pp. 37-55.

The only survivor from the massacre of the Royal Family was their King Charles spaniel, called Joy – as if to point out, on the one hand, that this was the culmination of the European revolution that began with the beheading of King Charles I of England, and on the other, that "through the Cross [of martyrdom] joy has come into the world" (Mattins of Pascha, ikos).

mystic and mysterious race had been chosen for the supreme manifestations, both of the Divine and the diabolical… From the days of 'Spartacus' Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States), this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Nesta Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others."[12]

Douglas Reed writes: "The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, which wielded the supreme power, contained 3 Russians (including Lenin[13]) and 9 Jews. The next body in importance, the Central Committee of the Executive Commission (or secret police) comprised 42 Jews and 19 Russians, Letts, Georgians and others. The Council of People's Commissars consisted of 17 Jews and five others. The Moscow Che-ka (secret police) was formed of 23 Jews and 13 others. Among the names of 556 high officials of the Bolshevik state officially published in 1918-1919 were 458 Jews and 108 others. Among the central committees of small, supposedly 'Socialist' or other non-Communist parties… were 55 Jews and 6 others."[14]

Even the "pro-Semite" historian Richard Pipes admits: "Jews undeniably played in the Bolshevik Party and the early Soviet apparatus a role disproportionate to their share of the population. The number of Jews active in Communism in Russia and abroad was striking: in Hungary, for example, they furnished 95 percent of the leading figures in Bela Kun's dictatorship. They also were disproportionately represented among Communists in Germany and Austria during the revolutionary upheavals there in 1918-23, and in the apparatus of the Communist International."[15]

---

[12] *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920; quoted in Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Durban, S.A.: Dolphin Press, 1978, pp. 272-273.

[13] However, Lenin was partly Jewish. His grandfather was called Israel before his baptism by an Orthodox priest, and his father's name was Moishe Blank. See Lina Averina, "Evrejskij koren'" (The Jewish Root*), Nasha Strana* (Our Country), January 22, 1997.

[14] Reed, op. cit., p. 274. According to Donald Rayfield (*Stalin and his Hangmen*, London: Viking, 2004, p. 74), in 1922, the Jews "reached their maximum representation in the party (not that they formed a coherent group) when, at 15 per cent, they were second only to ethnic Russians with 65 per cent."

[15] Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime, 1919-1924*, London: Fontana Press, 1995, pp. 112-13. Jews - even religious Jews - continued to play a major role in the Communist parties of Eastern Europe until well after the Second World War. For example, Anna Pauker was a

The London *Times* correspondent in Russia, Robert Wilton, reported: "Taken according to numbers of population, the Jews represented *one* in ten; among the commissars that rule Bolshevik Russia they are *nine* in ten; if anything the proportion of Jews is still greater."[16]

On June 9, 1919 Captain Montgomery Shuyler of the American Expeditionary Forces telegrammed from Vladivostok on the makeup of the presiding Soviet government: "… (T)here were 384 'commissars' including 2 negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians, and more than 300 Jews. Of the latter number, 264 had come to Russia from the United States since the downfall of the Imperial Government."[17]

Of course, the Jewish Bolsheviks were not religious Jews, and were in fact as opposed to Talmudic Judaism as any other segment of the population.[18] Moreover, as Pipes points out, "the results of the elections to the Constituent Assembly indicate that Bolshevik support came not from the region of Jewish concentration, the old Pale of Settlement, but from the armed forces and the cities of Great Russia, which had hardly any Jews".[19] So blame for the Russian revolution must fall on Russians as well as Jews; and in fact hardly any of the constituent nations of the Russian empire can claim to have played no part in the catastrophe.

Nevertheless, the extraordinary prominence of Jews in the revolution is a fact that must be related, at least in part, to the traditionally anti-Russian and anti-Christian attitude of Jewish culture, which is reflected in both of its major political offspring – Bolshevism and Zionism. For, as Chaim Weitzmann, the first president of Israel, showed in his *Autobiography*, the atheist Bolshevik Jews and the theist Zionist Jews came from the same milieu, often the very same families; so that his mother was able to witness her sons' triumph both in Bolshevik Moscow and Zionist Jerusalem…[20]

---

prominent Jewish communist in Romania after the war. Again, Moses Rozen became a member of the Romanian Communist Party after the war, and continued to serve the Romanian Communists even after becoming Chief Rabbi of Romania in 1948, and continued to have a strong influence after the fall of Ceausescu in 1989. See *Pyatnitsa* (Friday), N 69, January 22, 1997, p. 8.

[16] Reed, op. cit., p. 276.

[17] Vladimir Kozyreff, "[paradosis] Re: A New One", orthodox-tradition@yahoogroups.com, June 11, 2006.

[18] However, they did sympathize with it more than with any other religion. Thus on October 18, 1905 the Jewish revolutionaries in Kiev boasted that they would turn St. Sophia cathedral into a synagogue. (Lebedev, op. cit., p. 428). Again, in 1919 they erected a monument to Judas Iscariot in Tambov! See *Leningradskaia Panorama* (Leningrad Panorama), N 10, 1990, p. 35.

[19] Pipes, op.cit., p. 113. Edward Roslof writes: "80% of the Russian population voted for socialist deputies to the Constituent Assembly" (*Red Priests: Renovationism, Russian Orthodoxy, and Revolution, 1905-1946*, Indiana University Press, 2002, p. 15).

[20] Weitzmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weitzmann*, New York: Harper, 1949.

Moreover, so complete was the Jewish domination of Russia as a result of the revolution that it is a misnomer to speak about the "Russian" revolution; it should more accurately be called the anti-Russian, or Russian-Jewish revolution. Indeed, the Russian revolution may be regarded as one branch of that general triumph of Jewish power which we observe in the twentieth century in both East and West, in both Russia and America and Israel. It is as if, by God's permission and for the chastisement of the sins of many nations, there arose in the Pale of Settlement an avenging horde that swept away the last major restraining power and ushered in the era of the Apocalypse.

If we turn to the philosophical basis of the revolution, we find the same Jewish element seemingly inextricably entwined with it – and this not only because so many of the theorists of the revolution were Jews. As Bertrand Russell pointed out, many elements of the Marxist system are reminiscent of Judaism: the same striving for the promised land on earth and in time (communism and the withering away of the state); the same division of the peoples of the world into the chosen people (the proletariat) and the goyim (the exploiting classes), and the hatred incited against the latter; and the same cult of the false Messiah (the infallible leader or party).[21]

At the heart of the philosophical system of Marxism-Leninism lies *utopianism*. Igor Shafarevich has traced examples of utopian thought and statehood in many epochs and geographical regions. He has concluded that it is always (a) totalitarian, leading to the abolition of private property, the family and religion, and (b) guided by a kind of death-wish which results in the physical and spiritual death of the people.[22]

Under the name of "chiliasm" or "millenarianism", utopianism was one of the earliest Christian heresies (with, as we might now expect, a strongly Jewish colouring). It is possible that the addition of the phrase: "Whose Kingdom shall have no end" to the Nicene Creed at the Second Ecumenical Council in Constantinople in 381 was aimed against this heresy.[23] For chiliasm essentially amounted to the belief that Christ Himself will come to earth before the Last Judgement in order to install His Kingdom physically for a period of a thousand years, this Kingdom being characterised, according to the heretics, by the triumph of the Jewish race and the Jewish law. But the Church rejected this, teaching that the true Kingdom of Christ will come only after the Judgement, and that it will then be a spiritual Kingdom that is "not

---

[21] Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy*, London: Allen Unwin, 1947, p. 383

[22] Shafarevich, "Sotsializm", in Solzhenitsyn, A. (ed.) *Iz-pod Glyb* (From Under the Rubble), Paris: YMCA Press, 1974; *Sotsializm kak yavlenie mirovoj istorii* (Socialism as a Phenomenon of World History), Paris: YMCA Press, 1977.

[23] However, Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia writes (personal communication, 21 January, 1997): "It seems more probable that it was directed against the theories of Marcellus of Ancyra (who was not a millenarian); Marcellus and his followers are mentioned in Canon One of the 381 Council. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, takes the view that the clause in question is aimed against Marcellus. Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*, says nothing about any condemnation of millenarianism in 381."

of this world" and "has no end". We can enter the Kingdom of God partially before the Judgement, but only in and through the Church, which is not, and can never be, a sensually apprehended, temporal kingdom, still less a Jewish kingdom when "in Christ there is neither Greek nor Jew" (Galatians 3.28).

The former revolutionary-turned-monarchist Lev Alexandrovich Tikhomirov wrote: "In spite of the seeming irreligiousness of the 19th century, in its most passionate dreams it is reminiscent of a moment not so much of cold unbelief, as of *an error of religious thought,* Jewish messianism or the Christian *chiliasm* that was born from it. The idea of earthly all-blessedness, whether it is expressed in the expectation of 'the sensible kingdom of Christ' or of a sorrowless 'future order' in the most various of philosophies, grows on the soil of one and the same psychology. The new chiliasm has *consciously* abandoned religion. But this difference is not as decisive as it seems. The very dreams about an *earthly* blessedness are already a rebuke to the weakness of spiritual feeling. On the other hand, the unconscious feeling which makes our rationally unbelieving revolutionaries, not simple epicureans, but fanatical dreamers about their future sorrowless order, bear unmistakeable signs of the spiritual strivings of an erring religious quest…

"One may even now foresee some features of a future *mystical* anarchism, which is still thought now by the revolutionaries to be sick and illogical, but – as in Count L. Tolstoy, for example, - is already making itself talked about, and not only in Russia…

"It is not the inadequacies of the old order, but an insuperable dream about the new order that was and will remain the moving power of the revolution…"

"There is nothing that can be done against further corruption until people understand the source of the mistake.

"This mistake consists in the concept of *the autonomy of the personality*. The false teaching of its supposed autonomy appears first of all as a result of its rebellion against God. Being left without God, and in this condition feeling itself to be autonomous, the personality at first tries to find a full satisfaction of its strivings in this earthly world. But this is impossible. The world is not capable of that. From here there begins the renunciation of the world in the form that it is according to these earthly laws. One after another there appear dreams of 'the future order'. Trying these orders, the autonomous personality rejects them one after the other, intensifying its rejection of the real world more and more…"[24]

Again, the philosopher Simeon Ludwigovich Frank, another (Jewish) convert from Marxism to Christianity, wrote: "Socialism is at the same time

[24] Tikhomirov, "Bor'ba veka" (The Struggle of the Century), in *Kritika Demokratii* (A Critique of Democracy), Moscow, 1997, pp. 189-190, 191, 192, 195-196.

the culmination and the overthrow of liberal democracy. It is ruled by the same basic motive that rules the whole modern era: to make man and mankind the true master of his life, to present him with the possibility of ordering his own destiny on his own authority..."

"Socialism is the last stride in the great rebellion of mankind and at the same time the result of its total exhaustion - the complete spiritual impoverishment of the prodigal son in the long centuries of his wandering far from his father's home and wealth."[25]

Utopianism-chiliasm is based not only on a heretical eschatology, but also on a false anthropology that denies the fall of man. For utopia on earth is possible only on the assumption that the men who live in the utopia are sinless and passionless, being governed by perfect love and humility. But to suppose that any class of men, once delivered from injustice and poverty, will automatically behave like angels, is a myth. This is the error of the early, theistic utopias such as Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*, and Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*. And that the Russian communists recognized these utopians to be akin to themselves is proved by the fact that they erected a monument in the Kremlin to Thomas More and another utopian, Tommaso Campanella.[26]

However, there is another, related error of utopianism: the idea that the glorious end of utopia justifies any means to its attainment. In practice, this doctrine was not practised or preached by the noble pagan or Christian utopians such as Plato or More. And yet the institution of the Inquisition – set up during More's lifetime and by his own Roman Catholic Church – is clearly already infected by the idea. And as the dechristianization of Europe proceeded, it became still more common to think that the kingdom of love and brotherhood can be ushered in by hatred and fratricidal war. However, the means do not justify the ends; and the employment of evil means leads unfailingly to evil ends. As Solzhenitsyn said, the line between good and evil passes, not between classes or nations, but down the middle of each human heart. Therefore the final triumph of good over evil is possible only through the purification of the human heart, *every* human heart. And that is a spiritual task which is accomplished by spiritual, not material or political means, by confession of the faith and repentance of sin, not by rebellion against kings and the redistribution of property.

This brings us to a still deeper flaw of utopianism – its materialism. For while the heresy of chiliasm at any rate recognized the existence of God and the spiritual nature of man, utopianism reduces everything to the blind determinism of insensate matter. For the ancient heretics, utopia could only be introduced by God, and was awarded to the righteous in response to the

---

[25] Frank, "Religioznoe-Istoricheskoe Znachenie Russkoj Revoliutsii" (The religio-historical significance of the Russian revolution), *Po Tu Storonu i Po Pravu (On That Side and on the Right)*, Paris: YMCA Press, 1972.

[26] Courtois, in *The Black Book of Communism,* op. cit., p. 2.

right use of their freewill. For the moderns, there is neither God nor freewill – but utopia will come in any case, as the result of the iron laws of necessity. And this fatalistic faith both gives the revolution its frightening power – for men acquire extraordinary self-confidence when they know that they must win in the end – and guarantees its terrifying cruelty – for without freewill there is no responsibility, and, as one of Dostoyevsky's characters said, "if there is no God, everything is permitted".

"Cosmic possession," writes Fr. Georges Florovsky," – that is how we can define the utopian experience. The feelings of unqualified dependence, of complete determination from without and full immersion and inclusion into the universal order define utopianism's estimate of itself and the world. Man feels himself to be an 'organic pin', a link in some all-embracing chain – he feels that he is unambiguously, irretrievably forged into one whole with the cosmos… From an actor and creator, consciously willing and choosing, and for that reason bearing the risk of responsibility for his self-definition, man is turned into a thing, into a needle, by which someone sews something. In the organic all-unity there is no place for action – here only movement is possible… There is no place for the act, no place for the exploit (podvig)."[27]

If chiliasm-utopianism is one of the earliest Jewish Christian heresies, the division of the world into "clean" and "unclean" classes or nations is the earliest, being the subject of the very first Church Council held at Jerusalem under the presidency of the Apostle James. Nor is such a temptation confined to the Jews: nationalism, the exaltation of one's own nation or class as being essentially superior to all others, is a perennial temptation for all nations, and never more so than among certain Orthodox nations now. When God commanded Noah to lead pairs both of "clean" and of "unclean" animals into the ark, and when He commanded the Apostle Peter to eat of both "clean" and "unclean" foods, He demonstrated that there is no essentially clean nation. "For there is no difference; for all have sinned, all have fallen short of the glory of God" (Romans. 3.22-23). All outside the ark, the Church of Christ, are unclean; and all inside the Church are, if not completely clean, at any rate in the process of being cleansed. And all, regardless of nationality, can enter the Church. For "is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not the God of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also, since there is one God Who will justify the circumcised by faith and the uncircumcised through faith" (Romans. 3.29-30).

Of course, nationalism is not always a pathological phenomenon, and has often contributed to the saving of a nation and the buttressing of the true faith; so perhaps we should reserve the term "nationalism" for the pathological phenomenon, while using another term – "patriotism", say – for the positive phenomenon to which we now wish to draw attention. Thus when, in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Russian Emperor Nicholas I approved of the Slavophile slogan "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Narodnost", he

[27] Florovsky, "Metafizicheskie predposylki utopizma" (The Metaphysical Presuppositions of Utopianism), *Put'* (The Way), June-July, 1926, p. 30.

was referring by "Narodnost" to the positive virtue of patriotism or love of country. Narodnost was linked to Orthodoxy in the minds of Nicholas and the Slavophiles, because it was subject to Orthodoxy and exalted the nation, not for its own sake and not in opposition to other nations, but for the sake of the supra-national idea of Orthodoxy.

However, the revolution strives to destroy the collective personality of each nation, just as it strives to destroy the individual personality of each man. Thus Lenin said that the aim of socialism was not only the drawing together of the nations, but also their fusion – i.e. their destruction. For, as Dostoyevsky wrote, "socialism deprives the national principle of its individuality, undermining the very foundations of nationality."[28]

Of course, Lenin was not averse to approving of and stirring up the nationalisms of the smaller nations of the Russian empire in order to destroy the God-bearing nation that he hated and feared the most. But having stirred up nationalist feeling, he then tried to destroy it again, subordinating the nations to the only nation and caste of which he approved – the nation of Jewish internationalism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.[29]

The paradox that socialism both incites nationalism and destroys the nation is one aspect of the general paradox of the socialist revolution, that while preaching freedom it practises slavery, while proclaiming equality it creates inequality, and while dreaming of brotherhood it incites fratricidal war. In the same way, the French revolution proclaimed the freedom and equality of all nations; but its first appearance on the international arena was in the form of Napoleonic imperialism, which strove to destroy the freedom of all the nations of Europe. And paradoxically, it was autocratic Russia, the conqueror of Napoleon, which guaranteed the survival of the nations of the West, and their freedom from totalitarianism, for at least another century.

For the truth is that the revolution, while inciting the passions for personal and national freedom in order to destroy the old church and state structures, was aimed at the destruction of all freedom and individuality, both personal and national. And while hypocritically invoking those ecumenical ideals which Christianity gave to the world – "neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female," – it actually aimed at their complete destruction by destroying the pivot upon which they all rest – "for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3.28). Thus like the serpent in the Garden of Eden, it promised life, but delivered death…

However, even more than its anti-personal and anti-national passion, the deepest, longing of the Jewish-Russian revolution is its worship of the false Messiah. Through its utopianism, the revolution merges the personalities of

---

[28] Dostoyevsky, *The Diary of a Writer*, 1877; Haslemere: Ianmead, 1984, p. 738.

[29] I. Shafarevich, "Obosoblenie ili sblizhenie" (Isolation or Rapprochement), in Solzhenitsyn, op. cit..

its adherents into an elemental, all-embracing process to which they surrender their freedom and personality. And through its class-warfare and anti-patriotism, it destroys those last strongholds of personal and collective freedom that stand in the way of its final victory. But what is such a "victory", if there is no victor to whom to give the spoils, no personal cause of the victory of the proletariat? That is why the revolution is incomplete until it has found its god, why the personal "modesty" of Lenin had to be "corrected" by the "all-wise" Stalin, and why the collective Antichrist of Sovietism must one day reach its apotheosis in the personal Antichrist of Judaism…

In *The Brothers Karamazov* Dostoyevsky saw this need for universal worship as lying at the heart of the revolution. He traced its origin to the worship of the infallible Pope and, still further back, to the worship of the imperator-pontifex maximus of pagan Rome. Deep in the soul of man, as Blessed Augustine pointed out, there is a God-shaped hole; and if that hole is not filled by the worship of the true God, it will be filled by the worship of a false god; and to that god, man will give himself totally. The need for worship and total self-sacrifice is as alive now, in our materialist age, as it has ever been.

Now the West has ascribed the emergence of totalitarianism in Russia to the weakness of her democratic institutions in 1917 and to her long history of autocratic rule. The satanocracy of Bolshevism, according to this conception, is closely akin to the theocracy of Holy Russia, both being opposed to the "true godliness" of western democracy.

In truth, however, society by its very nature is hierarchically ordered. Thus Bishop Dionysius (Alferov) of Novgorod writes: "The cell of the State is the family. In the family the father is the head by nature, while the son is subject to him; the authority of the father is not the result of elections in the family, but is entrusted to him naturally by the law of God (Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow). Just as from the extended family of the tribe there arises the people, so out of the family headed by one man there arises tsarist autocracy. Both the familial and the monarchical organization are established by God for the earthly existence of the sinful, fallen man. The first-created man, living in living communion with God, was not subject to anyone besides God, and was the lord of irrational creation. But when man sinned, destroying the Divine hierarchy of submission and falling away from God, he became the servant of sin and the devil, and as a consequence of this became subject to a man like himself. The sinful will of man requires submission for the restraint of his destructive activity. This Divine ordinance has in view only the good of man – the limitation of the spread of evil. And history itself shows that whatever the inadequacies of monarchies, they bear no comparison with that evil that revolutions and anarchies have brought to the peoples.

"Monarchical administration has been established by God in accordance with His likeness. 'God being One established the authority of one person; as Almighty – autocratic authority; as Eternal – hereditary authority' (Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow). Such is monarchy in general, independent

of its spiritual content; being established in accordance with the likeness of God, it already has an educational religious significance. Christian monarchy was formed and developed under the immediate leadership and grace-filled sanctification of the Church of Christ, and for that reason has a special spiritual content."[30]

The revolution strove to overthrow this natural order, not out of a love of the people, but in order that one people – the Jewish – should rule over all. For, as the Talmud says, "the Messiah is, without metaphor, the Jewish people"[31] This was clear already in the French revolution, when, having won, by dint of bribery, personal influence and violence, the emancipation of their race, the Jews so abused their newly won privileges that in 1806, on returning from Austerlitz, Napoleon was forced to convene a special meeting of the Sanhedrin in order to ask them the straight question: are you loyal to the French State and its laws?

In the nineteenth century, democracy, liberalism and Jewish emancipation spread everywhere; only Russia and Romania refused to give the Jews full civil rights. Therefore the Jews, having come to power in the West on the back of democracy and liberalism, sought to spread it through revolutionary propaganda also in the East, where most Jews still lived. The vast area in the West of Russia known as "the Pale of Settlement" became a seething hive of revolutionary activity aiming at the overthrow of the Orthodox autocracy and the imposition of a Jewish "dictatorship of the proletariat".

However, with the exception of a few such as Plekhanov and Lenin, Marxism did not attract the Russian intelligentsia, without whose support the revolution could not succeed. They were ensnared by the more "moderate" doctrine of liberalism, which preached the freedom of the individual from the State. But, having been ensnared by the more "moderate" doctrine, they placed themselves in the power of the extremists, and prepared the way for the imposition of the most totalitarian State power.

For as the notorious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, whose authenticity is suspect, but whose intelligence is not[32], put it: "From liberalism were born the constitutional states, which took the place of Autocracy which was saving for the goys. And a constitution, as you well know, is nothing other than a school for scandals, quarrels, arguments, disagreements, fruitless party agitation and party tendencies – in a word, a school for everything that will depersonalise

[30] Bishop Dionysius (Alferov) of Novgorod (under the pseudonym Tuskarev), *Tserkov' o Gosudarstve* (The Church on the State), Staritsa, 1992, pp. 9-10.
[31] Quoted in Elizabeth Dilling, *The Jewish Religion: Its Influence Today*, The Noontide Press, 1983.
[32] The *Protocols* purport to be the minutes of a meeting of Jewish elders somewhere in the West, but are in fact largely plagiarized from Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Montesquieu et Machiavel*, published in 1864. When the forgery was demonstrated to Tsar Nicholas II by Stolypin, he said: "Drop the *Protocols*. One cannot defend a pure cause by dirty methods." See Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide*, London: Serif, 1996, pp. 126, 285-289.

the activity of the state… By such measures we will acquire the possibility of abolishing, little by little, step by step, everything that, at the beginning when we entered into our rights, we were forced to introduce into state constitutions, for the transfer to the unnoticed removal of every constitution, when the time will come to transform every government into our autocracy…" (Protocol 10)

"Depersonalised" states are always weak: the people cannot express their victory fully without having a focus for it in the veneration of a leader. So the overthrow of the personal autocracy of the kings by depersonalised democracy could not stop there, but had to go on to its ultimate consequence – the enthronement of the Jewish king, the Antichrist. As the Jewish revolutionaries said in Kiev in 1905: "We gave you God, and we will give you a Tsar!"[33]

Thus in modern times we see an ever-quickening descent from autocracy to democracy to the Antichrist. Democracy cannot be more than a transitional phase because the rule of the people by the people is a contradiction in terms; for "rule" means the imposition of one will on the will of the people, which, at least in its fallen state, is always multiple. It is possible for one man to rule with the consent of the people and for the benefit of the people; but it is impossible for the State to be ruled by the people itself.

That is why the great saints of the nineteenth and early twentieth century insisted on the necessity – the *religious* necessity – of faithfulness to the Tsar. St. Seraphim of Sarov said that after Orthodoxy, faithfulness to the Tsar was "our first Russian duty and the chief foundation of true Christian piety". Again, St. John of Kronstadt said: "The autocracy is the sole condition of the piety of Russia; if there is no autocracy, there will be no Russia; power will be taken by the Jews, who greatly hate us…" And Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow, the apostle to the Altai, said: "You don't want your own Russian authority, so you will have a foreign power over you…" [34]

[33] Lebedev, op. cit., p. 428.

[34] Quoted in Sergius Fomin, *Rossia pered vtorym prishestviem* (Russia before the Second Coming), Sergiev Posad: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1993, p. 100.

3. THE ORIGINS OF THE ANTICHRIST: (2) ECUMENISM

If communism destroys the traditional bases of hierarchical authority in political and social life, declaring that the Tsar is entitled to no more honour than the simplest peasant, ecumenism does the same in religious life, declaring that no one religion is truer or more worthy of respect than any other.

Ecumenism is the heresy that there is no such thing as heresy as the Apostles and Fathers of the Church understand that term – that is, a false teaching on the Faith. Ecumenism is the heresy that there is no single Faith, whether Orthodox, Papist or Protestant, which expresses the fullness of the truth, and that all existing faiths (except Ecumenism itself) are more or less in error. It implies that the One, Undivided Church of Christ has foundered on the reef of sectarian strife, and that She has to be re-founded on the sands of doctrinal compromise and indifference to the truth. It is the tower of Babel rebuilt, a babble of conflicting tongues united only in their insistence that they all speak the same language…[35]

Ecumenism has deep roots in European history. In a sense the Roman Empire was ecumenist, since it embraced all religions so long as they did not constitute a threat to the State. It was only the Christians and the Jews who did not accept the Roman thesis that all religions are to be respected, asserting on the contrary that "all the gods of the pagans are demons" (Psalm 95.5).

The origins of ecumenism as a *religious* movement go back to Asia Minor in the second century, where Apelles, a disciple of the heretic Marcion, introduced what has been called "the atheist dogma of Apelles", but which is more popularly known as "ecumenism". As the Athonite Elder Augustine writes: "Apelles, the head of the numerous sect, venerable both for his life and for his age, wanted to undertake the pacification and unification of all the shoots of the heretic Marcion under a single rule and authority. With this aim he exerted all his powers to come into contact with all the leaders of the sects, but had to admit that it was impossible to persuade each sect to abandon its unreasonable dogmatic teaching and accept that of another. Having come away from his attempts at mediation with no fruit, he decided a bridge had to be built, a way of living together peaceably, or a mutual tolerance of each other, with a single variety of 'faith'…

"Starting from this point of view, he established an atheist dogma of unity, which has been called, after him, 'the atheist dogma of Apelles', with the notorious slogan: '… We don't have to examine the matter thoroughly, everyone can remain in his faith; for those who hope on the Crucified One,' he declared, 'will be saved so long as they are found to have good works.' Or, to put it more simply: 'it is not at all necessary to examine the matter – the differences between us – but everyone should retain his convictions, because,'

[35] V. Moss, "The Truth is One", in *The Imperishable Word*, Old Woking: Gresham Books, 1980.

he declared, 'those who hope on the Crucified One will be saved so long as they are found to practise good works!… 'It would be superfluous to explain that this atheist dogma of Apelles was first formulated by the heretic Marcion himself (whom St. Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John, called 'the first-born of Satan') and is entirely alien to the Christians. We Christians love the heterodox and we long for a real and holy union with them – when they become sober and believe in an Orthodox manner in our Lord Jesus Christ, abandoning their heretical and mistaken beliefs and 'their distorted image of Christ'."

Apelles' dogma was condemned at the Fifth Ecumenical Council, but, like all the early heresies, it reappeared at a later date. Thus in the year 384, Symmachus, the pagan leader of the Roman Senate, wrote to the Emperor Theodosius the Great, appealing to him to be tolerant towards the pagans because, as he said, many paths led to God… Again, the twelfth-century Arab philosopher and doctor Avveroes pleaded for a kind of union between Christians, Jews, Muslims and pagans that was avidly discussed in western scholastic circles.

The Romanist variant of Apelleanism known as uniatism appeared after the schism of 1054. As Elder Augustine explains: "After the canonical cutting off of the Latins from the Church as a whole in 1054, that is, after their definitive schism and anathematisation, there was also the acceptance, or rather the application, of the atheist dogma of Apelles. The Catholic (=Orthodox) Church of Christ condemned the heresies of the Nestorians, Monophysites and Monothelites in the (Third, Fourth and Sixth) Ecumenical Councils. It anathematised the heretics and their heretical teachings and declared those who remained in the above-mentioned heresies to be excommunicate. *The apostate 'church' of Rome took no account of the decisions of these Ecumenical Councils, but received into communion the unrepentant and condemned Nestorian, Monophysite and Monothelite heretics without any formality, with only the recognition of the Pope as Monarch of the Church. And not only the heretics, but also many others after this, were received into communion with only the recognition of the Monarchy of the blood-stained beast that presided in it."*

However, Apelleanism in its modern, ecumenist variety is really a product of the Protestant Reformation. Thus the Anglican Settlement of the mid-sixteenth century was a kind of Protestant Unia, the Anglican Church being allowed to retain some of the outward trappings of Catholicism – but without its central pivot, the papacy, which was replaced by obedience to the secular monarch as head of the Church. Being a politically motivated compromise from the beginning, Anglicanism has always been partial to ever more comprehensive schemes of inter-Church and inter-faith union, and many leaders of the ecumenical movement in the twentieth century were Anglicans.

In 1614 there appeared the first modern ecumenist, George Kalixtos, a man famous, according to Elder Augustine, "for the breadth of his knowledge and his 'eirenic' spirit in tackling various questions, including ecclesiastical ones.

Propelled by this spirit, he declared that there was no need of, nor did he even seek, the union of the various Churches… Nevertheless, he did demand their mutual recognition and the retaining of reciprocal 'love' through the reciprocal tolerance of the manifold differences of each 'Church'…"[36]

In modern times, the first major impulse to ecumenism came from the Protestants, who rejected the idea of the Church as "the pillar and ground of the Truth" (I Timothy 3.15) and vaunted the power of the individual mind to find the truth independently of any Church. This led to a proliferation of Protestant sects, which in turn led to attempts to achieve unity by agreeing on a minimum truth, which in turn led to the idea that all faiths are true "in their own way". As religious passions cooled round Europe, the Freemasons took the lead in preaching religious tolerance and indifference. But they went further by saying that underlying all religions there was a "true, primitive, universal religion". In accordance with this principle, Jews were admitted to the masonic lodges as early as 1724.[37]

The ecumenism of Masonry was linked to the crisis of faith that was taking place in the Anglican church in the early eighteenth century, and in particular to the loss of faith in the unique truth and saving power of Christianity. Thus "in 1717," wrote William Palmer, "a controversy arose on occasion of the writings of Hoadly, bishop of Bangor, in which he maintained that it was needless to believe in any particular creed, or to be united to any particular Church; and that sincerity, or our own persuasion of the correctness of our opinions (whether well or ill founded) is sufficient. These doctrines were evidently calculated to subvert the necessity of believing the articles of the Christian faith, and to justify all classes of schismatics or separatists from the Church. The convocation deemed these opinions so mischievous, that a committee was appointed to select propositions from Hoadly's books, and to procure their censure; but before his trial could take place, the convocation was prorogued by an arbitrary exercise of the royal authority…"[38]

Hardly coincidentally, 1717, the year in which Hoadly's heretical views were published, was the same year in which the Grand Lodge of England, was founded. And we find a very similar doctrine enshrined in Dr. Anderson's *Constitutions*: "A Mason is obliged, by his tenure, to obey the moral Law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine. But though in ancient Times Masons were charged in every Country to be of the Religion of that Country or Nation, whatever it was, yet, 'tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that Religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to themselves; that is to be good Men and true, or Men of Honour

[36] Monk Augustine, "To atheon dogma tou Oikoumenismou Prodromou tou Antikhristou" (The atheist dogma of Ecumenism, Forerunner of the Antichrist), *Agios Agathangelos Esphigmenites* (St. Agathangelos of Esphigmenou), NN 120, July-August, 1990, pp. 20-21, 121, September-October, 1990, pp. 33-34.
[37] Jasper Ridley, *The Freemasons*, London: Constable, 1999, p. 40.
[38] Palmer, *A Compendious Ecclesiastical History*, New York: Stanford & Swords, 1850, p. 165.

and Honesty, but whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguish'd; whereby Masonry becomes the Centre of Union and the Means of Conciliating true Friendships among Persons that must have remained at a perpetual Distance."

A new and extremely deceptive concept was here introduced into the bloodstream of European thought: "that Religion in which all men agree". *There is no such thing*. Even if we exclude the "stupid Atheists" and "irreligious Libertines" (of whom there are very man), we still find men disagreeing radically about the most fundamental doctrines: whether God is one, or one-in-three, or more than three, whether He is to be identified with nature or distinguished from it, whether He is evolving or unchanging, whether or not He became incarnate in Jesus Christ, whether or not He spoke to Mohammed, whether or not He is coming to judge the world, etc. Upon the answers to these questions depend our whole concept of right and wrong, of what it is "to be good Men and true". Far from there being unanimity among "religious" people about this, there is bound to be the most radical disagreement between them.

Later developments in Anglicanism, such as the Oxford movement of the 1840s, introduced the idea of "the Branch theory of the Church". According to the Oxford theologians E.B. Pusey and William Palmer, the Church consisted of three branches – Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Anglicanism (preferably in the "High Church" variety they espoused). However, "Low Church" Anglicanism also made its contribution. Thus Archbishop Vitaly (Ustinov) of Canada saw the forerunners of ecumenism in the "Low Church" Anglicanism of the Victorian era and in the semi-Christian ideologies of the YMCA, YWCA and the Boy Scouts with their belief in the basic goodness of human nature, light-minded attitude to sin, emphasis on charity as the handing out of earthly goods not in the name of Christ, cult of the flesh under the cover of concern for heath and hygiene, carnal emotionalism, interconfessionalism and condescending attitude towards dogmatic Christianity.

Especially important in the construction of this Tower of Babel, he says, "is the complete spiritual disintegration of the Protestant heresy. But if we say, together with Tertullian: 'the human soul is naturally Christian' – by which this western teacher of the Church undoubtedly meant: 'naturally Orthodox' – then we can affirm that every heresy by its very nature is contrary to the human soul and must sooner or later be rejected and cast out by it. And so we are present at the overthrow of the Protestant heresy, but insofar as the spiritual world, like nature, abhors a vacuum, the place of this heresy is being occupied by Ecumenism. For Ecumenism seeks to re-establish the dogma of the One Church that Protestantism with its innumerable sects and ever-multiplying divisions has destroyed."[39]

[39] Archbishop Vitaly, report read to the Hierarchical Council of the Russian Church Abroad at Machopac in 1967, reprinted in *Moskva* (Moscow), 1991, N 9, p. 146.

Ecumenism may be described as religious egalitarianism, the doctrine that one religion is as good as any other. When combined, as it was in the lodges of Europe and America, with political and social egalitarianism, that is, communism, it made for an explosive mixture – a programme for revolutionary action. And this revolutionary potential of Masonry became evident very soon after it spread from England to the Continent…

A critical role in the development of ecumenism (as of communism) was played by Rousseau, who insisted that his subjects should believe in a "civil religion" that combined belief in "the existence of an omnipotent, benevolent divinity that foresees and provides; the life to come; the happiness of the just; the punishment of sinners; the sanctity of the social contract and the law".[40] If any citizen accepted these beliefs, but then "behaved as if he did not believe in them", the punishment was death. As Jacques Barzun writes: "Rousseau reminds the reader that two-thirds of mankind are neither Christians nor Jews, nor Mohammedans, from which it follows that God cannot be the exclusive possession of any sect or people; all their ideas as to His demands and His judgements are imaginings. He asks only that we love Him and pursue the good. All else we know nothing about. That there should be quarrels and bloodshed about what we can never know is the greatest impiety."[41]

A further major impulse to ecumenism was provided by the Romantic movement and its philosophical mirror, Hegelian idealist historicism, which emphasised the inevitability of historical change in all things, even – God! For God for the romantics was a dynamic, evolving being indistinguishable from nature and the temporal process, always overcoming contradictions and rising to ever higher unities. It followed that the notion of a perfectly revealed religion, a final, unalterable truth, was anathema to them. "Christians must not be 'vain and foolish', Friedrich Schleiermacher warned, for their religion is not the only 'revealed religion'. All religions are revealed from God. Christianity is the center around which all others gather. The disunity of religions is an evil and 'only in the totality of all such possible forms can there be given the true religion,' Schleiermacher added."[42]

A Romantic scheme of history and the evolution of religion was given by Friedrich Schelling in his Berlin lectures of 1841-1842 (many of which were attended by leading Russian intellectuals). "In the Twenty-Sixth Lecture," writes Fr. Michael Azkoul, "Schelling discoursed on the three ages of history – the age of the Father, the age of the Son, and the age of the Holy Spirit which correspond to the events of creation, redemption and consummation. Schelling believed that Christianity was now passing through 'the second age' which Christ 'incarnated' almost two millennia ago.

---

[40] Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, London: Penguin Books, p. 286.
[41] Jacques Barzun, *From Dawn to Decadence*, New York: Perennial, 2000, p. 387.
[42] Fr. Michael Azkoul, *Anti-Christianity: The New Atheism*, Montreal: Monastery Press, 1984, p. 34.

"In the vocabulary of the Romantics, Christ brought 'the Idea of Christianity' with Him. An 'Idea' is the invisible, unchangeable, and eternal aspect of each thing. (Plato was probably the first to teach 'Idealism'.) Phenomena are visible, changeable, and temporary. Put another way, the Idea of Christianity ('one Church') is what the historical institution will become when it finishes growing, or, as Schelling would say, when God becomes fully God. One may compare its Idea to wheat and historical Christianity (the Idea) to what Protestantism, Roman Catholicism and Eastern Christianity will become. When the multiplicity of churches grows into the ecumenical Church, then, the Idea of Christianity, of 'one church', will have been actualised in space and time. It will be actualised in the coming of 'the third age', 'the age of the Spirit', 'the age of consummation'."[43]

A third major impulse to ecumenism, especially in its more recent, "super-ecumenist" (that is, inter-religious) manifestations, came from the Pentecostal movement. At precisely 7 p.m. on New Year's Eve of the year 1900 "the age of the Spirit" and "the new Pentecost" is supposed to have dawned. For it is to that moment that the modern Pentecostal movement dates its origin.

"For some time before that moment," writes Hieromonk Seraphim Rose, "a Methodist minister in Topeka, Kansas, Charles Parham, as an answer to the confessed feebleness of his Christian ministry, had been concentratedly studying the New Testament with a group of his students with the aim of discovering the secret of the *power* of Apostolic Christianity. The students finally deduced that this secret lay in the 'speaking in tongues' which, they thought, always accompanied the reception of the Holy Spirit by preaching that there is no one truth, and therefore no one Church which it can be the pillar of. It maintains that all Churches – and in its more extreme, contemporary forms, all religions – contain partial or relative truths which, on being reduced to their lowest common denominator, will form the dogmatic basis of a new Church or universal religion of a new, enlightened mankind."[44]

A fourth impulse to ecumenism was *spiritual pacifism.* It is no accident that ecumenism began after the end of the German Wars of Religion in the seventeenth century, that it received another strong impulse after the First World War, and that its first institutional expression – in the World Council of Churches – appeared after the Second World War. When people are tired of war, whether physical or spiritual, they settle for the path of least resistance: the renunciation of all struggle for the truth.

The false pathos of both communism and ecumenism is *unity* – unity among workers of all nations in the one, and among believers of all denominations in the other. Christians who succumbed to this pathos were

---

[43] Azkoul, op cit., pp. 77-78.
[44] Rose, *Orthodoxy and the Religion of the Future,* Platina, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Monastery, 1983, pp. 148-149.

ready to surrender the Church's truth, freedom and dignity to the dominant forces in the contemporary world, with the ultimate end, whether conscious or unconscious, of the complete *secularization* of the human race. The heresies of communist and ecumenist "Christianity" attempted to justify or "dogmatize" this apostasy – in the former case, by claiming that only such apostasy can *save* the Church (from destruction by communism), and in the case of ecumenism by claiming that only such apostasy can *recreate* the Church (out of sectarian disintegration). Essentially, therefore, they were (and are) two aspects of a single politico-ecclesiological heresy, for which the present writer has coined the term "ecucommunism"[45], a single assault on the existence and the dogma of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church…

Ecucommunism threatens completely to destroy the foundations of Christian civilization. It is part of a still broader movement, the attack on the concept of *Tradition* as the source of truth not only in the Church, but in all branches of knowledge. This wider movement has been variously called modernism, secularism and renovationism; but could still more simply be called *the Revolution*.

The Revolution has been through several historical stages, of which the revolution in the Church accomplished by Pope Gregory VII in the eleventh century was the first. Papism led to Scholasticism and Humanism, then Protestantism, Scientism, Deism, Materialism, Romanticism, Hegelianism, Darwinism, Marxism, Freudianism, Ecumenism and, most recently, New-Ageism. It is beyond the scope of this work to show how all these "isms" are connected and take their origin from the primal rebellion against the Church in the eleventh century. Suffice it to say for the present that underlying the revolution in all its stages is a single antichristian, antitheist, man-centred philosophy.

This philosophy can be summarized as follows:- Man is his own master. If there is a God, then he is a God in man's own image, perhaps even of man's own making; and man does not depend on Him to learn the truth, for his own unaided mind is capable of that. The wisdom of the ages is a myth; tradition is a brake on progress. As man is a product of evolution from the lower animals, so his social and religious and political institutions are in a process of constant upward evolution. Therefore there is no such thing as absolute truth, no sacred, unchanging, God-given authority. Everything is in flux, therefore everyone must change. The only unchanging, ineluctable fact is the fact of the revolution – the social revolution, the political revolution, the religious revolution, and above all the scientific revolution upon which all the other revolutions are based. Therefore the only unforgivable sin (if it is not simply a kind of illness, which can be treated by drug-therapy in a psychiatric hospital) is *the sin of counter-revolution,* the sin of being bigoted, intolerant of change, out-of-date. Everything is permitted – the craziest of beliefs, the most deviant of life-styles – so long as it does not stand in the way of the revolution, that

[45] V. Moss, "Ecucommunism", *Living Orthodoxy*, September-October, 1989, N 5, pp. 13-18.

revolution which is making man master of himself and of his environment. But for those who stand in the way of "progress", there will be no mercy; they will be cast onto the rubbish heap of history like the extinct species of Darwinian pre-history. For nothing must stand in the way of man's ascent to godlike status. Just as in physics the anthropic principle "seems to be on the verge of substituting man for God, by hinting that consciousness, unbound by time's arrow, causes creation"[46], so in life based on the scientific revolution man must substitute himself for God, removing all those constraints associated with the Divine Creator…

[46] Marek Kohn, "Joyfully back to Church?", *New Statesman and Society*, May 1, 1992, p. 32.

4. RUSSIA AND THE BALKANS

Only a little less damaging to the Orthodox commonwealth than communism and ecumenism was *nationalism*. Already in 1872, in the wake of the schism between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Church, the patriarchate had anathematized the heresy of *phyletism*, or nationalism, together with the Exarchate that the Bulgarians had created on a national basis and independently of the Patriarchate. Unfortunately, the Greeks were no less sinners in respect of nationalism than the Bulgarians, and in the Balkans as a whole nationalism was rampant. Strong national feeling founded on faith had helped to preserve the integrity of the Orthodox nations during the centuries of the Ottoman yoke. But it served them less well when that yoke was crumbling, and the new kind nationalism inspired by the French revolution had infected them and was beginning to infect their Muslim enemies.

The Treaty of Berlin (1878) was in general a huge disappointment for the Slav nations. Russia, it seemed, had snatched diplomatic defeat out of the jaws of military victory, while great powers who had played no direct part in the Russo-Turkish war had managed to gain succulent morsels at the expense of the Orthodox. Thus Britain snapped up Cyprus, while Austria-Hungary gained a protectorate in Bosnia and greater influence in the region as a whole, which forced Serbia to seek good relations with that great power at the expense of her relations with Russia.

Nevertheless, the international recognition of the independence of Serbia and Romania, together with the virtual independence of Bulgaria (even if shorn of much of her territory), was something to rejoice at. The Balkan Orthodox could now look forward to final liberation from the old enemy, Turkey, in the not so distant future. The question was: could they unite into some kind of federation or commonwealth that would bring that joyful event forward, and perhaps also help to reduce the power and influence of Austria-Hungary – the other old enemy, whose power, unlike that of Turkey, was increasing?

There were several possibilities. One was "Yugoslavism", a federation of Slavic peoples stretching from the Croats in the West to the Bulgarians in the East, in which Serbia would serve as the geographical core and magnet, "the Piedmont of the South Slavs". Of course, this presupposed the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which Russia had opposed in 1848 even while rescuing the Habsburg Slavs from the Hungarian counter-revolution.

Another was "Illyrianism" – that is, Yugoslavism without Bulgaria, Surprisingly, perhaps, in view of later, twentieth-century century history, there were many Catholic Croats and Slovenes – including the famous Catholic Bishop and opponent of papal infallibility, Strossmaier - who were enthusiastic about joining such a State. The Bulgarians were not part of this idea because of their frequent wars with Serbia over Macedonia.

A third possibility was Great Serbia, the union of all the South Slavs, including those in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but excluding Bulgaria, under the Serbian king.[47]

In the long term, however, what mattered most was not the precise form of the relationship between the South Slav states as how truly Orthodox the resultant unitary state or confederation of states would be. And here the signs were not encouraging.

First of all, a truly Orthodox state required or a strong "symphony" between King and Church. But this was nowhere to be found in the Balkans, imbued as the region was increasingly becoming with western ideas of democracy and constitutionalism. Moreover, both Romania and Bulgaria were ruled by Catholic Germans imposed on them by the great powers**,** while the Greek King George was Lutheran – and there could be no symphony between them and the Orthodox Church. Thus Protopriest Benjamin Zhukov writes: "In Austria-Hungary the Orthodox Serbs and Romanians did not pray for their emperor Franz-Joseph, who was not Orthodox. In exactly the same way the names of King George, a Lutheran, and King Ferdinand, a Catholic, were not commemorated in Orthodox Greece and Bulgaria. Instead their Orthodox heirs to the throne were commemorated. This attitude to the authorities sometimes led to conflict with them. Thus in 1888 the Bulgarian Synod was dismissed by Ferdinand of Coburg, and the members of the Synod were expelled by gendarmes from the capital because they refused to offer prayer in the churches for the Catholic prince, who had offended the Orthodox Church by many of his actions. After this the government did not allow the Synod to assemble for six years…"[48]

Serbia was the only Balkan state ruled by native Orthodox kings – but they had the unfortunate habit of being killed by rival dynastic factions…

The sad fact was that, while the Balkan states seemed more independent than ever before, the gap in power between them and the major western states – Britain, France, Austria-Hungary and Germany – was increasing at the same time that western interference in the region – partly for commercial reasons, but partly also out of fear of Russia – was also increasing. Logically, therefore, the Balkan Orthodox should have sought, not only some kind of unity amongst themselves and the immediate cessation of their proxy wars over Macedonia (about which more anon), but also closer ties with the only Orthodox great power – Russia. Indeed, now as never before was the time when the idea of "the Third Rome" needed to be put into practice, not for the

[47] Judah, *The Serbs,* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009, third edition, pp. 93-94.

[48] Zhukov, *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' na Rodine i za Rubezhom* (The Russian Orthodox Church in the Homeland and Abroad), Paris, 2005, pp. 18-19.

selfish motive of the aggrandisement of Russian power, but for the sake of the survival of the Orthodox Christian commonwealth as a whole…

Now for both religious and historical reasons, Russia could never remain indifferent to, or detached from, events in the Balkans. In the tenth century Russia received her Orthodox faith from the Greeks of the New Rome of Constantinople. For nearly five hundred years, until the council of Florence in 1438-39 and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the rulers of Russia, although de facto independent of, and much more powerful than, the Byzantine Emperor, considered themselves de jure only junior partners of the Emperor, while the huge Russian Church remained only a single metropolitan district of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. After the fall of Constantinople, the Balkan Slavs and Greeks looked to the Russians as potential liberators from the Turkish yoke, and in 1562 Tsar Ivan IV received a gramota from the Ecumenical Patriarch Joasaph calling him "*our* Tsar", ascribing to him authority over "Orthodox Christians in the entire universe", and applying to him the same epithets, "pious, God-crowned and Christ-loving" as had been applied to the Byzantine Emperors. Moscow "the Third Rome" been born…

The idea of the Third Rome has been subjected to much mockery and revilement as if it were just an excuse for nationalist ambition. But exactly the reverse is true: in acknowledging themselves to be the successors of the Byzantines, "the Second Rome", the Russians took upon themselves an *internationalist obligation*: to fight for the protection of all Orthodox Christians throughout the inhabited world. This involved, on the one hand, defensive wars against aggressive powers that invaded her territory from the west, such as the Swedes, the Germans, the Poles and the French. On the other hand, since most non-Russian Orthodox lived within, or within the orbit of, the major Muslim powers of Ottoman Turkey and Persia, it also involved almost continuous war along her southern frontiers and, in some cases – Georgia, for example - the annexation of the threatened Orthodox land in order to protect it from the Muslims. In all cases, it involved the shedding of Russians' blood for their fellow Orthodox Christians with no real gain for Russia, as in the liberation of Bulgaria from the Turks in 1877. To a large extent the history of Russia from the fifteenth century onwards can be seen as a slow, painful but inexorable advance to the fulfilment of the ideal of Christian Rome: the liberation of all fellow Orthodox Christians living under the yoke of heretical or pagan rulers.

The cost was enormous. It has been calculated that, quite apart from losses in terms of men killed, Russians taken into slavery by the Turks from the 15th to the 18th century inclusive numbered between three and five million, while the population of the whole of Russia in the time of Ivan the Terrible (16th century) numbered less than five million.[49] And yet losses of men killed or

[49] I.L. Solonevich, *Narodnaia Monarkhia (The People's Monarchy),* Minsk, 1998, pp. 403-404. The slaves included some who have been numbered among the saints, such as St. John the Russian (imprisoned in Turkey itself) and St. Paul of Cairo.

driven into slavery abroad were only the beginning of the cost. Both the institution of serfdom, which so upset the liberals, and that of military service from youth until (virtually) death, were the results, not of the despotic cruelty of the tsars, but of sheer military necessity...

If the western nations' cynical attitude to Russian expansion was only to be expected, it was less to be expected, and harder to take, from the very Balkan Orthodox who benefited from this expansion through the gradual weakening of Ottoman power. None of them saw in Russia "the Third Rome", and so none of them felt obliged to coordinate their political and military initiatives with Russia, as the leader of the Orthodox world. Paradoxically, this was especially the case after the Russian advance to the gates of Constantinople and the Congress of Berlin, whose results, while in general galling to the Orthodox, nevertheless established Serbia, Romania and (almost) Bulgaria as independent states.

To illustrate this point, let us look more closely at the unification of Bulgaria with East Rumelia referred to above. In 1885, a band of rebels seized control of Plovdiv, capital of Eastern Rumelia. Prince Alexander von Battenburg of Bulgaria, who had been threatened with "annihilation" by a Macedonian secret society if he did not support the coup, promptly marched into Plovdiv (Philippopolis), took credit for the coup, and proclaimed himself the ruler of a united North and South Bulgaria.

From a narrowly nationalist point of view, this was a triumph – one of the most galling decisions of the Treaty of Berlin had been reversed, and Bulgaria, though formally still not completely free of Ottoman suzerainty, was now de facto independent and united (if we exclude the disputed territories of Northern Dobrudja and Macedonia). However, from the point of view of the preservation of international peace, and still more of Pan-Orthodox unity, it was a disaster. The Bulgarians' violation of the Treaty of Berlin gave the Turks – still a formidable military power – a good legal excuse to invade Bulgaria, which would have dragged the Russian armies back into the region only eight years after the huge and costly effort of 1877-78, which in turn could have dragged other great powers into a major European war. So Tsar Alexander III, not undeservedly called "the Peacemaker", decided not to support his irresponsible nephew, Prince Alexander, and to withdraw the Russian officers from the army of his ungrateful ally. This was undoubtedly the right decision, but it cost him much - both in terms of an estrangement between Russia and Bulgaria, and in terms of his discomfiture at the hands of the British, who cynically decided to support the coup…

But this was not the end of the sorry story. The Serbian King Milan now invaded Bulgaria, boasting that he was going "on a stroll to Sofia".[50] Barbara Jelavich explains why this conflict took place: "Since the unified Bulgarian state would be larger and more populous than Serbia, Milan felt that he was

[50] Glenny, *The Balkans, 1804-1999,* London: Granta Books, 2000, p. 175.

entitled to compensation. He thus launched an attack in November 1885. Despite widely held convictions that the Bulgarian army, deprived of its higher officers by the Russian withdrawal, would be crushed, it in fact defeated the invaders. The Habsburg Empire had to intercede to save Milan. Peace was made on the basis of the maintenance of the former boundaries; Serbia had to accept the Bulgarian unification. The entire episode was an enormous blow to the king's prestige."[51]

All this was caused by the Balkan States' refusal to accept the leadership of Russia, "the Third Rome". This was, regrettably, to be expected of the Romanians, who resented the Russians' possession of Southern Bessarabia, and were always fearful of a return of the Russian protectorate. And it was to be expected of the Greeks, who accused the Russians, absurdly, of "Pan-Slavism", and who in any case were dreaming of a resurrection of Byzantium… But it was less expected of the Slavic states, who, proud of their newly acquired independence, decided to have completely independent – that is, egoistic, shortsighted and foolish - foreign policies that completely ignored the existence of the "batyushka-tsar" to the north, who alone, among Orthodox leaders, had the interests of the Orthodox Christian commonwealth as a whole at heart. Their behaviour confirmed Leontiev's thesis that there was little to choose between Greek and Slavic nationalism. And their failure to work more than intermittently with Russia was to lead to the most disastrous consequences over the next seventy years…

[51] Jelavich, *History of the Balkans,* Cambridge University Press, 1983, vol. 2, p. 31.

5. THE KOSOVAN AND MACEDONIAN QUESTIONS

Nationalist passions in the Balkans centred especially on two neighbouring territories: Kosovo and Macedonia. Both were under the Turkish yoke, but both were coveted by the Orthodox nations fighting for independence. Kosovo was coveted especially by Serbia, and Macedonia – by Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece.

By the 1870s the proportion of Muslims (including some Muslim Slavs) to non-Muslims (mainly Orthodox Serbs, but including about 11,000 Catholics) in Kosovo was about 60:40.[52] As a result of the Slav-Ottoman war of 1876-78, Serbia extended her territory to include the Niš region. But also in 1878 the Albanians formed the League of Prizren, the beginning of an all-Albanian independence movement (although that was not their aim at the beginning). However, in 1881 the League army was crushed by the Turks, and conditions in Kosovo descended into squalor, with deteriorating relations between the Kosovans and the Turkish administrators.[53]

At this point, when Serbs and Albanians might have been expected to unite against the Turks, a major deterioration in relations between the Serbs and Albanians of Kosovo took place. "The prime cause of this," writes Noel Malcolm, "was the mass expulsion of Muslims from the lands taken over by Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro in 1877-78. Almost all the Muslims… were expelled from the Morava valley region: there had been hundreds of Albanian villages there, and significant Albanian populations in towns such as Prokuplje, Leskovac and Vranje. A Serbian schoolmaster in Leskovac later recalled that the Muslims had been driven out in December 1877 at a time of extreme cold: 'By the roadside, in the Gudelica gorge and as far as Vranje and Kumanovo, you could see the abandoned corpses of children, and old men frozen to death.' Precise figures are lacking, but one modern study concludes that the whole region contained more than 110,000 Albanians. By the end of 1878 Western officials were reporting that there were 60,000 families of Muslim refugees in Macedonia, 'in a state of extreme destitution', and 60-70,000 Albanian refugees from Serbia 'scattered' over the vilayet of Kosovo. Albanian merchants who tried to stay on in Nish were subjected to a campaign of murders, and the property of those who left was sold off at one per cent of its value. In a petition of 1879 a group of Albanian refugees from the Leskovac area complained that their houses, mills, mosques and tekkes had all been demolished, and that 'The material arising from these demolitions, such as masonry and wood, has been sold, so that if we go back to our hearths we shall find no shelter.'

"This was not, it should be said, a matter of spontaneous hostility by local Serbs. Even one of the Serbian army commanders had been reluctant to expel the Albanians from Vranje, on the grounds that they were a quiet and

[52] Malcolm, op. cit., p. 194.
[53] Malcolm, op. cit., pp. 219-228.

peaceful people. But the orders came from the highest levels in Belgrade: it was Serbian state policy to create an ethnically 'clean' territory…"[54]

Hardly surprisingly, the Muslim refugee victims of Serbian ethnic cleansing, on arriving in Kosovo, were hostile to the local Serbs; and now for the first time the Albanians began to believe "that Serbia – and the Serbs of Kosovo who were claimed as an 'unredeemed' part of the Serbian population – represented a threat to their existence".[55]

So Serbs began to emigrate from the province. By 1912 the Serbian proportion of the population had dropped to about 25% or less...[56]

Meanwhile, the Kosovo myth in its modern, revanchist form was being born in Serbia. From about the 1860s Serbian poets and politicians began to put forward the ideology of a Greater Serbia, a unitary state that included all the lands populated by Serbs, even if they were in a minority. In their sights were Kosovo, on the one hand, and the Serb-populated lands of Austro-Hungary, on the other.

Not in vain did a Habsburg diplomatic circular of 1853 declare: "The claim to set up new states according to the limits of nationality is the most dangerous of schemes. To put forward such a pretension is to break with history; and to carry it into execution in any part of Europe is to shake to its foundations the firmly organized order of states, and to threaten the Continent with subversion and chaos…"

In 1889, on the five-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, Serbia's foreign minister told the Royal Academy that "an inexhaustible source of national pride was discovered on Kosovo. More important than language and stronger than the Church, this pride unites all Serbs in a single nation..."[57]

That national pride should be considered "stronger than the Church" was a danger sign. Nothing on earth is stronger than the Divine-human institution of the Church, which, as the Lord says, "will prevail against the gates of hell", whereas national pride can be crushed, and nations themselves can disappear completely... To say that any person or nation or institution is "stronger than the Church" is equivalent to idolatry…

*

As for Macedonia, according to Stevan K. Pavlowitch, it "has always been the centre of the Balkans which neighbouring states, and foreign powers

[54] Malcolm, *Kosovo: A Short History,* London: Papermac, 1998, pp. 228-229.
[55] Malcolm, op. cit., p. xlvi.
[56] Malcolm, op. cit., p. 230.
[57] Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans,* Cambridge University Press, 1983, vol. 2, p. 21.

interested in the peninsula, have vied with one another in trying to control. In modern times [the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries], it was the region that remained longest in Turkish hands. Serbs, Bulgars and Greeks had their various aspirations for its largely undifferentiated slavophone population. Out of this rivalry - at once nationalistic, cultural and ecclesiastical, as always in the Balkans - slowly began to emerge a separate Macedonian consciousness, recognised by none of the three contending nation-states, who were busy serbianising, bulgarianising and hellenising their outlying Macedonian territories."[58]

So who did the inhabitants of Macedonia think they were?

Glenny writes: "The question of the origins of the modern Macedonians, who feel themselves categorically to be a Slav people [with a large Albanian minority] distinct from Serbs or Bulgars, provokes more intellectual fanaticism than any other in the southern Balkans. One scholar, let us say from Skopje, will assume that this nation has existed for over a thousand years; the next, perhaps a well-meaning westerner, will claim that Macedonians first developed a separate identity from Bulgaria about one hundred years ago; a third, for the sake of argument a Serb, will swear that the Macedonians only emerged as a nation at the end of the Second World War; and a fourth, probably a Greek or Bulgarian, will maintain doggedly that they do not exist and have never done so...

"... In contested regions like Macedonia, national identity or identities do not remain stable. They change over a few generations; they mutate during the course of a war; they are reinvented following the break-up of a large empire or state; and they emerge anew during the construction of new states. Balkan nationalism evokes such ferocious passions because, paradoxically, it is so labile..."[59]

We must also not forget the Romanians, who from the beginning of the century "began to show a great interest in the Vlach population, which spoke a Romance language and was scattered throughout the area. Although Romania obviously could not advance claims for Macedonian territory, the issue could be used to gain compensation elsewhere. The Albanian position received very little recognition..."[60]

"The Greek national leaders had long expected eventually to absorb the entire area. Their arguments were based chiefly on the historical association of Greece, both classical and Byzantine, with the region. In a time before serious ethnographic studies were made, these leaders could sincerely believe that the population was indeed Greek. Certainly, Greeks and Muslim Turks formed the majority of the city inhabitants. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction

---

[58] Pavlowitch, "The Church of Macedonia: 'limited autocephaly' or schism?", *Sobornost,* 9:1, 1987, p. 42.
[59] Glenny, op. cit., p. 158.
[60] Jelavich, op. cit., p. 91.

exercised by the Constantinople Patriarchate after the abolition of the Pe and Ohrid authorities in the eighteenth centuries had given the Greeks control over cultural as well as religious matters. They thereafter tended to count all the Orthodox who were under the control of the Patriarchate as Greeks.... The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate [in 1870] was bitterly resented, because it ended the advantages previously held by the Greek churches. Even after it became apparent that the majority of the Christian people were Slavic, the Greek leaders continued to claim the area on a national basis; they argued that many of the inhabitants were what they called Slavophone Greeks, that is, individuals who were Slavic in language, but Greek in national sentiment.

"The Greek fears concerning the Exarchate were soon fully justified. Wherever two-thirds of a district voted for it, the Orthodox population could join this organization. This possibility naturally appealed to many Slavic-speaking people, for whom the attractions of a service in Church Slavic were much greater than those of one in Greek. The areas under the jurisdiction of the Exarchate thus expanded rapidly; the San Stefano boundaries [i.e. those marked out by the Treaty of San Stefano between the Russians and the Turks in 1878] were not greatly different from the lines of this religious authority. In the 1890s the Exarchate was able to add more districts. If nationality was to be used as the basis assigning ownership, Bulgaria had the advantage at the end of the century. Most Bulgarian leaders and the Bulgarian people were passionately convinced Macedonia was indeed rightfully theirs.

"Of the major rivals, Serbia was in the weakest position. Until 1878 its chief attention had been directed toward Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Old Serbia, which covered part of the Kosovo vilayet. After the Habsburg occupation of the two provinces, Serbia could expand only southward. In the agreement of 1881 with Vienna, [King] Milan had received assurances of support for such a move. Serbia thus entered with enthusiasm into the struggle for Macedonian lands, and exerted great efforts to demonstrate that the Macedonian Slavs were Serbs. Studies were made of the local languages and customs, and statistics were collected. Serbia opened consulates in 1887 in Thessaloniki and Skopje, and soon afterward in Bitola and Priština. A major propaganda campaign was launched inside Macedonia. From the beginning the efforts of the Serbs were hindered by their lack of an ecclesiastical organization equal to that of the Patriarchate and the Exarchate. They nevertheless made considerable advances before 1912."[61]

"It has been argued that if the Serbs, too, like the Bulgars, had separated themselves from the Greek-dominated patriarchate of Constantinople at that time, they could have achieved considerable success in those areas where Macedonian Slavs had not yet taken sides. For it was not all that difficult to give inchoate national traits a definite mould with the systematic action of church and school.

---

[61] Jelavich, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

"At first, the authorities of the autonomous principality of Serbia sympathised with Bulgarian aspirations. But they increasingly took fright after 1870 when, according to the statute granted to it, the autonomous Bulgarian Church began to expand. The sultan's firman established the authority of the Bulgarian exarch over a *millet* that was both territorial and ethnic. Broadly speaking, the dioceses of northern Bulgaria came within its jurisdiction, but upwards of two-thirds of the Orthodox Christian inhabitants of any other district could vote to join the exarchate. The principle of one territorial bishop thus came to be infringed occasionally, with a patriarchal and an exarchal bishop residing in the same see...

"... [The exarchate] thrived as a legal institution for Bulgarian national aspirations, and it sent out its priests and teachers to proselytise the slavophones of Macedonia. As a result it came to control territories that were to become Serbian in 1878... The reaction to these successes took the form of occasional calls for a separate archbishopric of Ohrid, but especially of Serbian government efforts to join forces with the Greeks. The idea was to convince the patriarchate that it was in its own interest to take into account the feelings of a majority of the faithful in making appointments to European sees, and to appoint ethnic Serbs where appropriate. Such efforts were at first hampered by the Serbo-Turkish wars of 1876-8 and the subsequent unpopularity of the Serbs with the Porte. It was not until the 1880s that Serbia entered the fray in Macedonia, with a proselytising programme of its own.

"By 1885, the ecumenical patriarchate had accepted the principle of sending ethnic Serbs to certain dioceses, provided they were Ottoman citizens, politically loyal to the Porte, and properly qualified canonically. But such candidates were not available at first, and it would take another eleven years before diplomatic pressure got the patriarchate to accept, but also the Porte to agree to, the first such Serbian bishop (Raška-Prizren, 1896), with two more by 1910 (Skopje, Veles-Debar). In these years at the turn of the century, with another set of slavophone bishops and priests who, furthermore, were fully canonical, whole districts chose to return from the exarchate to the patriarchate..."[62]

The tragedy of Macedonia consisted in the fact that it was as much a civil war among the Orthodox Christians as a war between the Orthodox and the Muslims. Moreover, even Orthodox clergy joined in the armed struggle. Thus the Kresna uprising against the Turks in 1878, which took place on the new frontier between Bulgaria and Macedonia, was led by a Bulgarian or Macedonian priest, Pop Georgievski-Berovski.

This rebellion was quickly crushed, and for some years the Ottomans were able to restore peace to the region. However, open warfare was now replaced

[62] Pavlowitch, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

by the building up of secret societies in both Bulgaria and Greece. At least three different Bulgarian societies fought with each other for leadership of the Macedonian struggle for independence. They also fought with the Bulgarian government, trying to persuade or force it into entering into a war of liberation in Macedonia. The Bulgarian Prime Minister Stambulov tried to resist their influence, but in 1895 he was killed by members of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (VMRO). A reign of terror followed in which Macedonian terrorists threatened to overthrow the Bulgarian State...

Meanwhile, in 1895 a Greek secret society called *Ethniki Etairia* tried to revive the traditions of the *Philiki Etairia.* "Just as VMRO was preparing to destabilize Bulgaria, so did the Etairia become a virtual state within the Greek state. The Etairia included many Greek Macedonian émigrés in its ranks, but the main focus of its aspirations was Crete..."[63] In 1896 the Cretans, whose slogan was "Freedom or Death!", rebelled against the Ottomans and called on the Free Greeks on the mainland to support them. They responded by landing an army onto the island.

"The great powers, smelling another Eastern Crisis, attempted to mediate between Turkey and Greece by suggesting that Istanbul offer Crete autonomy. By the middle of 1897, the Greeks were still procrastinating and so the Sultan decided to declare war on Greece. Turkish troops massed in Epirus on Greece's northern border and soon put the Greeks to flight. Before long the Ottoman troops were marching on an open road to Athens. Once again the great powers stepped into the breach and imposed a peace-deal on the two sides.

"The outcome was at first glance advantageous to the Greeks, as Crete was at last given extensive autonomy. But this apparent victory masked hidden dangers. The Greek army had suffered a great setback at Epirus. The Athenian coffers were empty; and the state had incurred an enormous debt. As part of the peace treaty, Athens was forced to hand over control of its budget to a great-powers commission. Furthermore, its network of agents in Macedonia had been destroyed.

"King George of Greece (1863-1913) had justified the military intervention in Crete by pointing out that 'Britain... had seized Cyprus; Germany had taken Schleswig-Holstein; Austria had laid claim to Bosnia and Herzegovina; surely Greece had a better right to Crete!' The argument was not unreasonable, but had the Etairia and King George reasoned more soberly they would have concluded that the Ottoman Empire would be forced to relinquish control of Crete at some future date. By succumbing to the romantic movement for the liberation of Crete and finding itself at war with the Ottoman Empire, Greece was too weak at the end of the nineteenth century to combat the influence of VMRO in Macedonia, and unable to respond when the Ottoman Empire allowed the Bulgarian Exarchate to

[63] Glenny, op. cit., p. 193.

establish three new bishoprics in Debar, Monastir (Bitola) and Strumitsa. This area extended like a long hand across the middle of Macedonia, marking out the dark shadows of a near future when the Greek Patriarchists and Bulgarian Exarchists would do battle for the souls of the villages...

"Conversions of whole villages were common. Sometimes they took place at the end of a gun barrel, sometimes there were compelling economic reasons, as H.N. Brailsford discovered at the time. 'I was talking to a wealthy peasant who came in from a neighbouring village to Monastir market. He spoke Greek well, but hardly like a native. 'Is your village Greek,' I asked him, 'or Bulgarian?' 'Well,' he replied, 'it is Bulgarian now, but four years ago it was Greek.' The answer seemed to him entirely natural and commonplace. 'How,' I asked in some bewilderment, 'did that miracle come about?' 'Why,' said he, 'we are all poor men, but we want to have our own school and a priest who will look after us properly. We used to have a Greek teacher. We paid him £5 a year and his bread, while the Greek consul paid him another £5; but we had no priest of our own. We shared a priest with several other villages, but he was very unpunctual and remiss. We went to the Greek Bishop to complain, but he refused to do anything for us. The Bulgarians heard of this and they came and made us an offer. They said they would give us a priest who would live in the village and a teacher to whom we need pay nothing. Well, sirs, ours is a poor village, and so of course we became Bulgarian.'..."[64]

The situation gradually descended into chaos. In March, 1903 the Austrian consul in Monastir reported: "The Committee [VMRO] is extorting money from Bulgarians, Greeks, Vlachs, Christians and Muslims, with indescribable arrogance. Christians who don't pay are murdered while the Muslim landowners must reckon with arson attacks on all their property...

"The longing for order among these unbearable circumstances and for a new, strong administration is becoming ever more intense... people do not want reforms, autonomy or whatever - the majority of Macedonians want nothing more than... the same fate as Bosnia [i.e. occupation by Austria-Hungary].

"Punitive executions continue to comprise standard fare of the guerrilla band activities. In the last 14 days alone, there has been a revenge murder of the Greek priest in Zelenic, the death of the teacher from Strebeno, and of a Patriarch supporter from Ajtos... [then] the Serbian priest from Vrbjani and an Albanian landowner from Lenista... whose throat was slit."[65]

During the spring of 1903 the village of Kruševo, whose 10,000 inhabitants were almost all Orthodox - Vlach, Greek and Slav, anticipating an attack by VMRO, approached the Ottoman authorities and requested that they

[64] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 194-195, 199.
[65] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 201-202.

strengthen their garrison. Sure enough, on August 2, "Ilinden" (St. Elijah's day), 300 guerillas assaulted Kruševo. Having killed the whole garrison, they occupied the town and proclaimed it a republic... The revenge of the Turks was terrible. The town was bombed and gutted. Irregulars and bashi-bazooks then went on a spree. "In addition to the thousands of murdered civilians and rape victims, 119 villages were burnt to the ground, 8,400 houses were destroyed, forcing 50,000 refugees to flee into the mountains, where many more died during the bitter winter that followed. Both the IO and the EO [other Macedonian revolutionary organizations] were almost obliterated and, after watching the Slav *četas* intimidate Greek villages, the Greek *andartes* swept through western Macedonia forcing the reconversion of Exarchate communities to the Patriarchate.

"The *andartes* now administered solace to those Patriarchate villages which had courageously resisted VMRO during the uprising. However, in the villages genuinely committed to the Exarchate or VMRO, the Greeks behaved like vengeful bullies, executing suspected renegades and holding the Patriarchate version of the Mass [Divine Liturgy] at gunpoint if the priest or townspeople were unwilling to perform the service. This Greek backlash was orchestrated by the gun-toting bishop of Kastoria, Germanos Karavangelis. This extraordinary figure, who roamed the countryside in a dark English raincoat with a black scarf wrapped around his priest's hat, 'had a Männlicher slung over one shoulder, a bandolier over the other, a belt round the middle from which hung his holster carrying a large pistol and a knife.' Karavangelis appeared consciously to cultivate an image of threatening romanticism. The bishop considered Bulgarian influence in the region to be the greatest threat to Greek national interests. He therefore advocated close friendship and cooperation between the Greeks and Turks of Macedonia, but only as an expedient. Karavangelis admitted openly that the only issue in Macedonia was the future contours of the Balkan states once the Turks had been thrown out.

"As VMRO's influence shrivelled and almost died, Karavangelis and his colleagues began to receive more money, weapons and men from the Greek Kingdom. This renewed Greek activity and the retreat of Bulgarian aspirations hastened a change in Serbian policy, too. Nikola Pašić, the old Radical leader and now Prime Minister, had long given up hope that his ideal of a federal solution for the Macedonian Question might be realized. Serbia would now be fighting for clerical and territorial influence not just against Greeks and Bulgarians, but also against the Turks and Albanians. Demonstrating again that neither Greeks, Serbs nor Bulgarians have natural allies, Pašić issued an order to Serbia's diplomatic representative: 'to protect our compatriots from the damaging consequences of the monopoly of Patriarchate organs which have placed themselves in the service of Hellenism to the detriment of the non-Greek adherents to the Patriarchate church; and to counter the activity of Exarchate agents whose Committees are appearing with weapons in those areas of eminent interest to us: Poreć, Kićevo, Drimkol, Dibra, Köprülü.' The suppression of Ilinden had therefore

failed to crush the nationalist struggle. On the contrary, it had made it worse. The struggle was spreading, but the balance of forces had changed. Like Bishop Karavangelis, the government of Istanbul considered the Bulgarian insurgency the most threatening. The Greek and Serbian guerrillas concentrated their efforts on expunging Bulgarian or Albanian influence on each other's - they proved less of a nuisance for the Ottoman forces. Indeed, the Christian guerrillas had to an extent assumed the state's role of policing the territory."[66]

Nevertheless, the international recognition of the independence of Serbia and Romania, together with the virtual independence of Bulgaria (even if shorn of much of the territory she claimed), was something to rejoice at. The Balkan Orthodox could now look forward to final liberation from the old enemy, Turkey, in the not so distant future. The question was: could they unite into some kind of federation or commonwealth that would bring that joyful event forward, and perhaps also help to reduce the power and influence of Austria-Hungary – the other old enemy, whose power, unlike that of Turkey, was increasing?

There were several possibilities. One was "Yugoslavism", a federation of Slavic states stretching from the Croats in the West to the Bulgarians in the East, in which Serbia would serve as the geographical core and magnet, "the Piedmont of the South Slavs". Of course, this presupposed the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which Russia had opposed in 1848 even while rescuing the Habsburg Slavs from the Hungarian counter-revolution.

Surprisingly, perhaps, in view of later, twentieth-century century history, there were many Catholic Croats and Slovenes who were enthusiastic about joining such a federation. The Croats and the Serbs of Croatia, Slavonia and Vojvodina had cooperated well in the revolution of 1848, and the increased power of Serbia after 1878 (King Milan was pouring a lot of money into his army) promised much. Thus the Croat sculptor Ivan Mestrovic was a philo-Serb and pro-Yugoslav whose works included the powerful *Milos Obilic* and the project for a Kosovo temple.

Yugoslavism in its original form, that is, including Bulgaria, was dealt a blow when the Bulgarian kingdom was reunited with East Rumelia in 1885, making Bulgaria the largest power in the Balkans. War broke out between the two countries in the same year, and Serbia was defeated. Finally, the rivalry over control of Macedonia destroyed any chance of the two Slavic Orthodox nations uniting.

However, a more attenuated form of Yugoslavism without Bulgaria survived. As Tim Judah writes: "In the latter years of the nineteenth century, ideas of Illyrianism or Yugoslavism in the Habsburg lands had undergone something of a decline. It was Hungarian attempts to play off Serbs and

[66] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 205-207.

Croats, however, and the continued division of Dalmatia from Croatia and Slavonia that helped revive the ideology. The single most important development here was the founding of the Croatian-Serbian Coalition of political parties in Croatia in 1905. Part of the understanding that led to this was that, if the Serbs would support Dalmatian unification with Croatia and Slavonai, which were being subjected to increasing Magyarisation, the Croats would support the principle of Serbian political equality within Croatia. In 1906 the Croatian-Serbian Coalition won the elections in Croatia-Slavonia. Central to its ideology was *narodno jedinstvo,* or Croat-Serb 'national unity', which was a precursor to the idea that Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and the other south Slavs were simply different names for parts of the same 'Yugoslav' nation.

"The Austrian and Hungarian authorities, who governed according to the principle of divide and rule, took fright at these developments and attempts were made to discredit the Croatian-Serbian Coalition. In 1909, a great treason trial of fifty-three Serbs was held in Zagreb, at which they were accused of having treasonous contacts with Belgrade. Evidence included the singing of Serbian epic poetry and the owning of portraits of King Peter, which were popular among the Serbs of Croatia. Although the trial ended in convictions, the charges were so widely seen as having been trumped up that the emperor was forced to issue pardons. Hard on the heels of this came a case in Vienna against Dr. Heinrich Friedjung. The eminent historian was accused of libel, having written an article claiming that leaders of the Croatian-Serbian Coalition were being funded by the authorities in Belgrade. What Friedjung had not known, however, was that the documents he had been given, which came from the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Ministry, were forgeries. The net result of both these cases was to alienate both Croats and Serbs from the Habsburgs and so to further the Yugoslav cause.

"In Serbia the idea of Yugoslavism was far less attractive than it was in the Habsburg lands. It was seen as one of three political options which governed thoughts about the future. The first and most prevalent was the creation of a Greater Serbia, including Bosnia and perhaps those lands in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia inhabited by large numbers of Serbs. The second was the formation of a somehow united Slav Balkans. This would include the Bulgarians, who were seen as no less south Slav than the Croats or the Slovenes. With the Bulgarian attack on the Serbs in 1913, though, this option was foreclosed. The third idea, that of Yugoslavism, while becoming increasingly prominent in academic circles, remained of little interest among politicians. In 1904, however, intellectuals and students founded *Slovenski Jug* (Slavonic South), a society which aimed at uniting the south Slavs.

"Over the next few years, there were increasing numbers of Yugoslav congresses and exhibitions held in Belgrade. In September, 1904, King Peter opened the First Yugoslav Art Exhibition. On display were 458 pieces by Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Bulgarian artists. In 1906, some 800 gathered

for a conference of teachers from all of the lands that would later become Yugoslavia…"[67]

In the long term, however, what mattered most was not the precise form of the relationship between the South Slav states as how truly Orthodox the resultant unitary state or confederation of states would be. And here the signs were not encouraging. First of all, a truly Orthodox state required or a strong "symphony" between King and Church. But this was nowhere to be found in the Balkans, imbued as the region was increasingly becoming with western ideas of democracy and constitutionalism. Moreover, both Romania and Bulgaria were ruled by Catholic Germans imposed on them by the great powers, while the Greek King George was Lutheran – and there could be no symphony between them and the Orthodox Church. Thus Protopriest Benjamin Zhukov writes: "In Austria-Hungary the Orthodox Serbs and Romanians did not pray for their emperor Franz-Joseph, who was not Orthodox. In exactly the same way the names of King George, a Lutheran, and King Ferdinand, a Catholic, were not commemorated in Orthodox Greece and Bulgaria. Instead their Orthodox heirs to the throne were commemorated. This attitude to the authorities sometimes led to conflict with them. Thus in 1888 the Bulgarian Synod was dismissed by Ferdinand of Coburg, and the members of the Synod were expelled by gendarmes from the capital because they refused to offer prayer in the churches for the Catholic prince, who had offended the Orthodox Church by many of his actions. After this the government did not allow the Synod to assemble for six years…"[68]

Serbia was the only Balkan state ruled by native Orthodox kings – but they had the unfortunate habit of being killed by rival dynastic factions… The most shocking example of this was the killing of King Alexander and Queen Draga of Serbia in Belgrade in 1903. This crime had the good side-effect that the pro-Austrian Obrenović dynasty was replaced by the pro-Russian Karadjordjević dynasty. But the long-term effects were evil; for the crime was neither deeply repented of, nor investigated sufficiently so as to bring the killers to justice. For, as Rebecca West writes, the new King Petar "was entirely surrounded by the conspirators whose crime he abhorred, and he could not dismiss them, because… with these fierce critics all about him perfectly capable of doing what they had done before, he had to keep order in a new and expanding country, vexed with innumerable internal and external difficulties."[69]

West goes on to assert, with pardonable exaggeration, that "when Alexander and Draga fell from that balcony the whole of the modern world fell with them. It took some time to reach the ground and break its neck, but

[67] Judah, *The Serbs,* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009, third edition, pp. 93-94.
[68] Zhukov, *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' na Rodine i za Rubezhom* (The Russian Orthodox Church in the Homeland and Abroad), Paris, 2005, pp. 18-19.
[69] West, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon,* Edinburgh: Canongate, 2006, p. 12.

its fall started then…"[70] For the shots in Belgrade in 1903 led to the shots at Sarajevo in 1914, which led to the First World War, which led to the Russian revolution…

For God is not mocked, and He does not allow anyone to touch His anointed kings. And the murder was a symptom of a wider revolutionary malaise, not only in Serbia, but in contemporary Orthodox Christendom as a whole, which took on a predominantly nationalist character in the Balkans and an internationalist character in Russia. Soon it was to bring down upon it the wrath of God and the end of the whole "Sardian" period of the Orthodox Christian Empire from St. Constantine the Great to Tsar Nicholas II…

[70] Ibid.

6. THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND "PROTO-ECUMENISM"

Greece after its liberation from the Turks was in a sorry state spiritually speaking. As Sotos Chondropoulos writes, "the new Bavarian king's court corrupted the traditional Orthodox values. This confusion greatly affected the priests, who struggled to lead the nation in its newly found freedom, just as they had during the hard years of Turkish oppression. Now, however, their values were steadily becoming more secular. The priesthood had become, in fact, nothing more than a routine vocation with many despots. The laity, in its instinctive wisdom, was aware of this but could do nothing since it was bound by politicians, scholars, and demagogues. So it turned satirical towards everything, including the church. Indeed, what a sad state of affairs it is when people mock their religious leaders."[71]

Men arose from within the Church who combatted these tendencies. However, they were not all of the same quality. Perhaps the finest was St. Nectarios of Pentapolis, who by his holy life and God-inspired writings showed that the great hierarchs of the patristic period had found a worthy successor. But he was little understood by his fellow hierarchs, and ended his earthly life in 1920 in virtual exile on the island of Aegina.

Another striking figure was the layman Apostolos Makrakis. He wrote openly against Freemasonry, which won him the approval of the hierarchy, and then against simony – which did not. Although he spoke eloquently against foreign influences and heresies, he was himself not pure in his teaching, and in 1878 the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece condemned him for teaching the tripartite composition of the soul and that Christ was perfected at His Baptism in the Jordan.

No less concerned about westernizing tendencies in the Church was the famous novelist Alexandros Papadiamandis, sometimes known as "Greece's Dostoyevsky". But he believed that the Church's condemnation of Makrakis should be obeyed, and he was critical of the religious brotherhoods that grew up in the wake of Makrakis' "School of the Word".

"In the first place," as Anestis Keselopoulos interprets his thought, "the brotherhoods transfer the center of the Church's life and worship from the parish and the church to the auditorium. Secondly, the lay theologians in the brotherhoods of his day present an easy, fashionable Christianity. In their sermons, they hesitate or are ashamed to speak of the Saints and miracles, of fasting and asceticism, of the battle against the passions and evil spirits. Thirdly, Papadiamandis takes issue with the type of religious man that the piety of the brotherhoods fashions and the pride and hypocrisy that the

[71] Chondropoulos. *Saint Nektarios: The Saint of Our Century.* Translated by Peter and Aliki Los. Athens, 1997. p. 48.

moralistic one-sidedness of the religious unions cultivate."[72] Papadiamandis entered into conflict with the Makrakians, and called Makrakis himself a "dangerous and much more unremitting opponent" than even "the cosmopolitan modernists and the atheist Kleona Ragavis."[73]

While closer to the hierarchy than Makrakis, Papadiamandis was not afraid to criticise the hierarchs, especially in their too-close relationship with the State. "Papadiamandis believes that 'the Church should be far from every governmental dependence and imposition'. He argues that 'the Church is victorious in the world without the slightest cooperation of the State; in fact, on the contrary, the Church has been much persecuted and exhausted by the State. Today, the Church can be victorious over every persecution when its leaders, having the consciousness of their high calling, seek the good of the Church in every way. Papadiamandis insists that the Church must not only distance itself from politics but also from the State in general. The Church must be particularly strict when a corrupt State asks Her, not only for small compromises but to commit sins on its behalf. He believes that the Church must be managed by the faithful themselves and not from the outside. In particular, the election and ordination of clergy must take place according to purely ecclesiastical criteria and procedures, and the Church should not be forced to accept the 'swarm of priests, boors and philistines that corrupt politics have many times imposed upon the eminent hierarchs to ordain."[74]

Turning from Free Greece to Greece under the Turks – that is, to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, we see that piety was in general higher, especially in the country districts of Anatolia, where holy priests such as St. Arsenius of Cappadocia (+1924) struggled. However, the capital suffered from various heterodox influences – not only the Islam of the Ottoman rulers, but also the Catholicism and Protestantism of the western powers and the Monophysitism of the Armenians. Thus in 1878 Patriarch Joachim II and his Synod decreed that Orthodox priests could give communion to Armenians who were isolated from their own priests and churches.[75]

Both the Catholics and the Anglicans were adopting a more "eirenical", ecumenist approach to inter-Church relations at this time. Pope Leo XIII had already shown himself a liberal in political terms, striving to come closer to the republican government of France, the Kaiser's Germany and even the revolutionary movement. He brought the Vatican into the world of stock-market speculation, and founded the first Vatican bank. Then, on June 20, 1894, he issued an encyclical on the union of the Churches "addressed," in the words of Patriarch Anthimus' encyclical in reply dated August, 1895, "to the sovereigns and peoples of the whole world, in which he also called on our Orthodox, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ to unite with the throne of

[72] Keselopoulos, *Greece's Dostoyevsky*, Protecting Veil, www.ProtectingVeil.com, 2011, p. 86.
[73] Keselopoulos, op. cit., p. 88.
[74] Keselopoulos, op. cit., p. 91.
[75] Monk Benjamin (Gomarteli), *Letopis' Tserkovnoj Istorii (1961-1971)* (A Chronicle of Church History (1961-1971), http://www.zlatoust.ws/letopis5.htm, p. 40.

the Pope, understanding this union in the sense that we should recognize him as the supreme pontiff and the highest spiritual and secular head of the whole Church scattered throughout the earth and the only deputy of Christ on earth and distributor of all grace". The encyclical that the patriarch wrote in reply to the Pope lists all the heresies of the papacy and calls on it to return to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic church. For "truly," continues the encyclical, "every Christian heart must be filled with the desire for the union of the Churches, especially the union of the whole Orthodox world… Therefore in her public prayers [the Orthodox Church] prays for the union of all those who are dispersed and for the return of all those who erred to the correct path of the truth, which alone can lead to the Life of all that exists, the Only-Begotten Son and Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ…"

The Catholic writer Adrian Fortescue finds this worthy reply "unpardonably offensive". In revenge, as it were, he mocks the internal divisions within the patriarchate in a manner that is tendentious but which nevertheless is worth quoting as demonstrating how the undeniably scandalous state of the patriarchate was perceived by the outside world: "In 1894 [Ecumenical Patriarch] Lord Neophytos VIII occupied the see. He was a prelate who really cared for the dignity and independence of his Church, and by way of restoring them he ventured on a feeble attempt at resisting the tyranny of the Porte [the Ottoman government] in canonical matters. But when he asked the other Orthodox Churches to help him (Russia could have claimed almost anything as the acknowledged protector of all Orthodox Rayahs), their jealousy of the Phanar was so much greater than their zeal for ecclesiastical independence that no one would do anything. The Bulgarian trouble, to which of course he could not put an end, alienated his own friends – they always seem to accuse the perfectly helpless Patriarch when the Bulgars become specially unbearable – so the Porte had no difficulty in making them depose him. On October 25 (O.S.), 1894, the synod and the mixed council agreed that he must resign, and a deputation of five members waited on him to inform him of their unanimous decision. So Neophytos VIII had to go back to private life in his house on the Antigone island. Having got rid of the Patriarch, the synod and the mixed council quarrelled so badly about his successor that their members excommunicated each other, and things came to an absolute block, till the Minister of Religions, Riza Pasha, wrote to say that he had annulled all their acts, and that they were to elect a new Patriarch at once. In defiance of the law the Porte struck off seven names from the first list of twenty-eight candidates which was sent up; one of these names was that of Germanos of Heraclea, who would otherwise almost certainly have been chosen. The popular candidate was the ex-Patriarch, Joachim III (1878-1884), but (it was said at the time) Germanos managed to get his name struck off too; so at last Anthimos VII (Metropolitan of Leros and Kalymnos) was elected. There was a tumult at his enthronement; the people wanted Joachim, and would cry 'Unworthy' (Ανθιμος αναξιος) instead of the proper form. Germanos had prudently retired to Vienna. However, Lord Anthimos began the reign in which he chiefly distinguished himself by his unpardonably offensive answer to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. In two

years the popular party succeeded in having him deposed. The immediate reason was the affair of Ambrose of Uskub [Skopje], in which he was accused of betraying the cause of Hellas. No accusation could have been more unjust. The cause of Hellas is the one thing no Œcumenical Patriarch ever betrays; he was only helpless before the Porte and the Russians. He did his best to keep his see. As soon as he heard that the synod wanted him to retire he suspended the leaders of the opposition and ordered them to go back to their dioceses. Of course they refused to obey. Poor Anthimos did all a man could. He went to the Yildiz-Kiösk and implored the Sultan to protect him, but the Sultan had other things to think about, and, on February 8, 1897, he went to swell the number of ex-Patriarchs, who wait in hope of being some day re-elected. There were now three – Joachim III, Neophytos VIII, and Anthimos VII. Constantine V (Valiades) was elected Patriarch in April. Lord Constantine seems to have been one of the best of all the later Œcumenical Patriarchs. He set about reforming the education of priests, insisted that the services of the Church should be celebrated with proper reverence, and modified some of the incredibly pretentious etiquette which his court had inherited from the days of the Old Empire. There seemed no possible reason why he should be deposed, except that the parties of the ex-Patriarchs wanted their candidates to have another chance. In the spring of 1901 it was first rumoured that Lord Constantine V was shaking on his throne. Twelve metropolitans of his synod and six laymen in the mixed council voted for his resignation. The rich bankers and merchants of the Phanar were all in favour of Germanos Karavangelis, of Pera. Constantine tried to remove that danger by sending him to be Metropolitan of Kastoria, a long way off in Macedonia. Nevertheless, on April 9th, Constantine's resignation was demanded by both synod and mixed council. But he did not want to resign, and for a time the Porte supported him. The Greek paper *Anatolia*, strongly partisan of the ex-Patriarch, Joachim III, all too hurriedly announced that Constantine had ceased to reign. It was immediately suppressed by the Government, and its proprietor was put in prison. The free Greeks of the kingdom were also all for Constantine. But in Holy Week his metropolitans again waited on him with the demand that he should resign. He was naturally indignant that they should disturb him during these august days, and he declared that his health was perfectly good and that he intended to go on presiding over the Orthodox Church. Four metropolitans were on his side. He celebrated the services of Holy Week surrounded by these four, but boycotted by all the rest of his synod. The opposition then sent an order to the four, forbidding them to communicate with the deposed one, and they besieged the Minister of Religions, Abdurrahman, with petitions for his removal. The Porte tried to save him as long as it could, but the opposition was too strong. Again there was an absolute block at the Phanar. The synod refused to sit under Constantine; and so he fell. He retired to Chalki, and Joachim III was re-elected. Lord Joachim, the reigning Patriarch, had already occupied the throne of Constantinople from 1878 to 1884. Since then he had been an ex-Patriarch with a strong party demanding his re-election. On Friday, June 7 (O.S.), 1901,

after the fall of Constantine V, he was chosen by eight-three votes, and the Porte then gave him his *berat*…."[76]

Joachim III introduced a period of relative stability into the patriarchate. But it was precisely in this period that the influence of Anglican ecumenism came most strongly to bear. This may have had something to do with the fact that Joachim himself was a Freemason…

Thus according to the leading organ of the patriarchate, "the first impulse towards official communion between the two Churches (Orthodox and Protestant) was provided by the Lambeth conference of July, 1897, in which 194 bishops from the whole Anglican communion came together and unanimously voted for action aimed at the union of the Churches… After this, in February, 1898, Archbishop Friedrich of Canterbury sent letters to the Patriarchs of the East and the Archbishop of Cyprus with copies of the decisions of the conference with regard to the union of the Churches… He asked the Orthodox Church accept the baptism of the Anglicans and allow her priests to give the Divine Gifts to dying Anglicans in places where they did not have their own priests… In September, 1899, in a letter to Patriarch Constantine V the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed the burning desire of the English for clearer understanding and the establishment of closer relations, declaring that it would be difficult to set out the details of such a course and that the longed-for communion should proceed with ever-increasing depth insofar as the determination of some kind of programme towards this end had been shown to be difficult… He pointed out that the communion of the two Churches would become surer through the cessation of proselytism, through visits of Orthodox clergy to London and of the Archbishop of Canterbury and English priests to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople on the great feasts and other official days, and through each Church telling the other of important changes taking place in her… On the basis of an agreement on these points by both sides, mutual correspondence began in December, 1900 and continued. After this various other events took place demonstrating the friendly relations between the two Churches…"[77]

The first such "demonstration of friendly relations" was Patriarch Joachim's declaring, in 1902, that Papism and Protestantism were "great ramifications (αναδενδραδας) of Christianity".

Before embarking on this ecumenist course, Patriarch Joachim wisely decided to issue an encyclical asking all the other Orthodox Churches (except Antioch and Bulgaria, whose hierarchies, for different reasons, he did not recognise) to express their opinions on union with the western churches. He also asked their opinion on the proposed change to the new, Gregorian

---

[76] Adrian Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1920, pp. 342-345.

[77] *Ekklesiastiki Alitheia* (Ecclesiastical Truth), 1920; in Monk Pavlos, *Neoimerologitismos Oikoumenismos* (Newcalendarism Ecumenism), Athens, 1982, pp. 17-19.

calendar. This was related to the ecumenical venture, because the difference between the old, Julian calendar used in the Orthodox East and the new, Gregorian calendar used in the Catholic-Protestant West was the first obstacle to the practical implementation of ecumenism – celebrating the major Christian feasts together.

The Local Orthodox Churches were unanimous in their rejection of the new calendar (Alexandria and strife-torn Cyprus did not reply). As for ecumenism, it is instructive to read the summary of the Churches' replies by a Fortescue: "His Holiness [Joachim III] speaks of the Latins with every possible charity, moderation, and courtesy, and hopes for reunion with us. Which hope may God fulfil. The difference of his tone from that of Anthimos VII, in the famous answer to Pope Leo XIII, is very remarkable. The answers of the sister-Churches, however, show how little they are disposed to listen to the voice of their honorary chief…

"Jerusalem answered cordially and sympathetically. Patriarch Damianos said that it is unhappily hopeless to think of reunion with Latins or Protestants as long as they go on proselytising in the East. But union with the Anglicans is possible and very desirable… Athens answered that no union is possible, least of all with the Old Catholics, who will not give a plain account of what they do or do not believe. Bucharest said that the only union possible would be the conversion of the Latin and Protestant heretics to the one true Orthodox Church; the Old Catholics are specially hopeless, because they have given up confession and fasting, try to unite with the Anglicans, and do not know what they themselves believe… Belgrade likes the idea of union with the Old Catholics especially… Russia answered at great length and very offensively [sic]. What, said the Holy Russian Synod, is the good of talking about reunion with other bodies when we are in such a state of disorder ourselves? It went on to draw up a list of their domestic quarrels, and hinted plainly that they were all the fault of the Phanar. For the rest, union with the Latins is impossible, because of the unquenchable ambitions of the See of Rome, which long ago led her to her fall. As for the Anglicans, the Church of Russia has always been well disposed towards them: 'We show every possible condescension to their perplexities, which are only natural after so long a separation. But we must loudly proclaim the truth of our Church and her office as the one and only heir of Christ, and the only ark of salvation left to men by God's grace.'"[78]

When Patriarch Joachim had received all the replies, he published a second encyclical in 1904 which expressed his own moderate, but firm opinion, both about ecumenism and about the first major step necessary in order to implement ecumenism in a practical way – the change from the traditional Orthodox Julian calendar to the papal Gregorian calendar that was in use throughout the West: "The Church is one, in identity of faith and similarity of

[78] Fortescue, op. cit., pp. 345-347. See also Eleutherios Goutzides, *Ekklesiologika Themata* (Ecclesiological Themes), Athens, 1980, vol. I, pp. 64-67.

habits and customs, in accordance with the decisions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils; and one it must be, and not many and diverse, differing from each other both in dogmas and in the basic principles of Church government…

"This is our opinion concerning the calendar: the Paschalion is venerable and immovable, having been fixed already centuries ago and sanctioned by the constant practice of the Church. In accordance with it, we have been taught to celebrate the radiant Resurrection of the Lord on the first Sunday after the full moon of the spring equinox, or on the Sunday following; and we are not allowed to make innovations in this. And it is mindless and pointless for those who are lying in wait to ambush our immovable Julian calendar by jumping only 13 days, so that our menologia and those of the followers of the other calendar should coincide. On the one hand, there is no compelling reason to omit all these days; such an act has no ecclesiastical or scientific justification. And on the other hand, the coincidence of the menologia will be only temporary, viz., until the year 2100, when there will again begin to be a difference of one day…"[79]

That should have been the end of the matter as far as the Orthodox Church was concerned. However, the tide of western pressure continued to rise. This came particularly from the Anglicans. The "High Church" wing of their Church took particular interest in the Russian Church, whose highly

[79] *Agios Agathangelos Esphigmenites* (St. Agathangelos of Esphigmenou), □ 124, March-April, 1990, pp. 17-19.

This was followed by a further bout of infighting among the hierarchs. Thus Fortescue continues: "So far then Lord Joachim III has shown himself a wise and admirable Patriarch. Alas! He has one fault, and that is an unpardonable one. He has already reigned five years, and the rival parties think it is quite time for him to retire, so as to give their favourites another chance. Already the opposition to him in his synod has declared itself. In January, 1905, there was a scene. Lord Prokopios of Durazzo led the anti-Joachimite side, and in a long speech attacked a number of the Patriarch's actions. 'Holy man of Durazzo,' said Joachim angrily, 'thou hast learnt thy lesson well. These are the plots brewed in the conventicles of the holy man of Ephesus.' 'All holy one,' said Joachim of Ephesus, 'there are no conventicles held in my house.' Then he, too, made a list of accusations, and eight metropolitans ranged themselves on his side. The Patriarch tried the old and always hopeless expedient of forbidding Prokopios to attend the meetings of the synod. That only brought matters to a climax. The eight members at once deposed Joachim and telegraphed the news to Petersburg, Bucharest, Athens, Belgrade, &c. Then, as usual, both sides appealed to the Sultan. Abdulhamid once more had the exquisite pleasure of lecturing them all on charity and concord. 'Patriarch Effendi,' says he, 'you are breaking the laws of the Church. You have no right to exclude Prokopios, and you must make it up with the eight metropolitans.' Then he sent for the eight. 'My metropolitans, what right have you to depose the Patriarch? It is not right. You must make it up with Lord Joachim.' He further hinted that if the precepts of their own Prophet are not enough to control their passions and to make them live in peace, he would have to refer the matter to the invincible Ottoman Police. Eventually the Minister of Religions, our inimitable friend Abdurrahman, last November, sent a note to Joachim, telling him his duty and the Canons of the Orthodox Church, and exhorting him to be a good Patriarch; but so far the Porte is for him and he still reigns. However, the opposition is by no means dead, and we may hear any day that he has gone the weary way to Chalki once more, and that a new bishop rules over the Great Church." (op. cit., pp. 347-348)

traditional ethos and status as a local national Church seemed to them to be a model of what the Anglican Church should be.

Unfortunately, the sincere interest of some Anglicans in Russian Orthodoxy did not go so far as to see in Orthodoxy the One True Church; and the rapprochement between the two Churches turned out to be more of a danger to the Russians than an opportunity to the Anglicans. In 1908 the Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar reported that a recent synod of the Anglican Church had decided that the Anglican Churches could baptize the children of Orthodox coming to Anglican priests in places where there were no Orthodox priests, but only on condition that this baptism was not repeated by Orthodox clergy. Then, in 1910, the first "World Missionary Conference" was convened in Edinburgh. This is considered by some to mark the historical beginning of the ecumenical movement. Its president, John Mott, was the first to introduce the terms "Ecumenism" and "ecumenical" into common currency.[80] In 1914 the "World Congress for International Friendship through the Churches". This led to the creation of the "Life and Work" Movement, which later combined with the "Faith and Order" Movement to form the World Council of Churches in 1948.

However, the outbreak of the First World War put a temporary halt to these developments…

*

It was not only the Greeks who were being influenced by Ecumenism. Thus during the First World War the famous Serbian theologian Fr. Nikolai Velimirovich served with Anglicans in London (he later turned away from ecumenism, and became a great confessor).[81] Again, Archbishop Tikhon, the future patriarch and hieromartyr, served with Anglicans in America.

The official service-books of the Russian Church reveal an unclear, ambiguous attitude towards the sacraments of the heretics and schismatics. Thus in the *Trebnik,* or *Book of Needs*, we read: "Know this also, that a schismatic baptism, and a heretical one, by those who believe in the Holy Indivisible Trinity, in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Church determines to be ultimately acceptable in every way."

Again, Bulgakov's *Nastol'naia Kniga*, or *Handbook for Clergy*, explains that Roman Catholics, if they have been baptised and confirmed, should be received by the "Third Rite", that is, renunciation of heresies and repentance. If they have not been confirmed, they must be chrismated. They must *never* be baptised.

---

[80] Monk Pavlos, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

[81] See Muriel Heppell, *George Bell and Nikolai Velimirovich"*, Birmingham: Lazarica Press, 2001.

"Recognising Baptism as a requirement for becoming a member of her, [the Russian Orthodox Church] accepts Jews, Muslims, pagans and those sectarians who distort the fundamental dogmas of the Orthodox Church through Baptism; Protestants are accepted through Chrismation; and those Catholics, Armenians and members of the Anglican Church who have not received Chrismation or Confirmation, and also those who have fallen away from Orthodoxy, she accepts through the Third Rite, through Repentance, repudiation of errors and Communion of the Holy Mysteries."[82]

As Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) explained, the refusal to rebaptise or reordain a heretic, and reception of him by the "Third Rite", did not entail the belief that the heretic was inside the Church. It was rather an acceptance that the *form* of these rites was correct and did not have to be repeated; so that this form became as it were a cup receiving the grace that is imparted only in the Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, however, this widespread practice of "economy" in the reception of heretics led to frequent misunderstandings in the ecumenical era that began after the First World War…

The 1903 Epistle of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church to Patriarch Joachim of Constantinople expressed firm opposition to union with the heretics. The hierarchs were "unchangeably convinced… that our Eastern Orthodox Church, which has inviolably preserved the complete deposit of Christ, is alone at the present time the Oecumenical Church". "As regards our relations with the two great ramifications of Christianity, the Latins and the Protestants, the Russian Church, together with all the autocephalous Churches, ever prays, awaits, and fervently desires that those who in times of old were children of Mother Church and sheep of the one flock of Christ, but who now have been torn away by the envy of the foe and are wandering astray, 'should repent and come to the knowledge of the truth', that they should once more return to the bosom of the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, to their one Shepherd. We believe in the sincerity of their faith in the All-Holy and Life-Originating Trinity, and on that account we accept the baptism of both the one and the other. We respect the Apostolic Succession of

---

[82] S.V. Bulgakov, *Nastol'naia Kniga sviaschenno-tserkovno-sluzhitelej* (Handbook for Church Servers), Kharkov, 1900, p. 928. In a footnote Bulgakov writes: "Accepting confirmed Anglicans [and Catholics] by the 'Third Rite' could be permitted only under the condition of recognition that the Anglican Church has a completely legitimate hierarchy, truly having preserved the grace of the priesthood in unbroken succession from the Apostles." In line with this acceptance of Anglican order, Bishop Tikhon of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, the future Martyr-Patriarch, attended the consecration of Reginald Weller as Episcopalian Bishop Coadjutor of the Diocese of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin in 1900" (*The Living Church*, November 17, 1900). In his diary under December 16/29, 1900, Archbishop Nicholas (Kasatkin) of Japan mentions this fact with some annoyance: "Why did Tikhon worm himself in there in a hierarchical mantia?"

With regard to the Syro-Chaldean Nestorians, the position of the Church of Russia was expressed in a Synodal ukaz dated March 17-21, 1898, N 1017, which stated that in accordance with the 95th Canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council they were to be received according to the Third Rite, and that their clergy had be received in full ecclesiastical rank, with no re-ordination.

the Latin hierarchy, and those of their clergy who join our Church we accept in the Orders which they then possess, just as we do in the case of Armenians, Copts, Nestorians and other bodies that have not lost Apostolic Succession. 'Our heart is enlarged' (II Corinthians 6.11), and we are ready to do all that is possible in order to promote the establishment upon earth of the unity which we so much desire. But, to our great regret and to the common grief of all true children of the Church, at the present time we are obliged to think, not so much of softening our relations towards Western Christians, and of a love-abounding drawing of their communities into union with us, as of the unwearying and ever-watchful defence of the rational sheep committed to our charge from unceasing attacks and multiform seducements on the part of the Latins and the Protestants."[83]

The "proto-ecumenism" of the Russian Church in this period came primarily from the tsars. Thus in 1847 Emperor Nicholas I concluded a concordat with Pope Gregory XVI which envisaged that the Russian Orthodox Church would carry out all the sacraments and needs for those who turned to her with such requests from the Catholics exiled for their participation in the Polish rebellions against Russia, if they were living in places where there were no Catholic churches or Catholic clergy. In accordance with the meaning of this concordat and the order of the Emperor, the Synod then issued the corresponding command, which was obligatory for the Russian Orthodox clergy, to satisfy the requests of exiled Catholics, if such requests came from them.

Again, as the Russian empire had expanded over the centuries, so had the number of subjects of other, non-Orthodox faiths, to the extent that by the late imperial period, as Igor Smolich says, it was no longer a "confessionally united kingdom", but an "interconfessional empire". Thus, as Archimandrite Macarius (Veretennikov) writes, commenting on Smolich's work, "Tsar Alexander III, for example, visited Buddhist temples and attended their services; [and] Tsar Nicholas II also (for example, during the world war) visited Catholic churches, Jewish synagogues and Muslim mosques, attended their services, and kissed the Catholic cross. From a purely ecclesiastical-formal point of view the Orthodox tsar should not have done that, but as the head of a super-confessional empire, as emperor, he was forced to it."[84]

---

[83] A translation of the whole Epistle is to be found in Athelstan Riley, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, London: Macmillan, 1917, pp. 247-257.

[84] Veretennikov, "K Voprosu Periodizatsii Istorii Russkoj Tserkvi" (Towards the Question of the Periodicisation of the History of the Russian Church), http://ao.orthodoxy.ru/arch/017/017-smol.htm, pp. 6, 11 (footnote 17).

7. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (1) CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

The Russian Orthodox Church existed in a close unity with, and in some respects dependence on, the Russian State. On January 25, 1721 Peter the Great issued his *Spiritual Regulation*, which abolished the patriarchy and instituted in its place "The Most Holy Governing Synod". "The activity of the Synod," writes Professor Michael Babkin, "was controlled by a secular person appointed by the emperor – the over-procurator of the Holy Synod, who was the official representative of the authority of his Majesty. The juridical basis of the foundation of the institution of the over-procurator was the necessity of reporting to the supreme power on the course of church affairs. The over-procurator's function was to preserve the interests of the State in the sphere of ecclesiastical administration and to control the organs of power of the Russian Orthodox Church in the centre (the Holy Synod) and locally (the spiritual consistories)… On the whole the competence of the over-procurator was limited to administration and did not extend to the sphere of the confession of faith or ecclesiastical law.

"Juridically, the participation of the emperor in church affairs raised the status of the Russian Orthodox Church and its decrees. The acts of the Holy Synod were published 'by order of his Imperial Majesty' in the form of ukases, directives or laws which became part of the collection of laws of the Russian Empire.

"The unity of Empire and Church based on the Orthodox faith, although it was not without its inadequacies, was on the whole very fruitful. The Empire supported the Russian Church morally and materially through the institution of the over-procurator, freed the episcopate from routine bureaucratic-chancellery work (linked, for example, with economic activity and the seeking of sources of finance), and supported its educational and missionary activity… In the Basic Laws there were more than a thousand articles protecting the privileges and property rights of the Russian Orthodox Church. The hierarchs were de facto high spiritual satraps of the Empire. According to the Table of Ranks, metropolitans, archbishops and bishops were equivalent to the first three classes of military and civil officials.

"Although the Russian Orthodox Church was literally merged with the Russian Empire, it did possess the rights of a juridical person and did not have self-administration. However, such rights were bestowed on the Holy Synod, parish churches, monasteries, spiritual-academic institutions and other church structures which possessed immovable property and capital."[85]

[85] Babkin, "Sviaschenstvo i tsarstvo: dukhovenstvo Pravoslavnoj Rossijskoj Tserkvi i sverzhenie monarkhii (nachalo XXv. – 1918g.) (The priesthood and the kingdom: the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Overthrow of the monarchy (the beginning of the 20th century to 1918), May, 2010, http://www.portal-credo.ru/site/print.php?act=news&id=77984, pp. 1-2.

In spite of these not inconsiderable advantages, the structure of Church-State relations in Russia was not ideal from an Orthodox point of view, being closer to the Protestant caesaropapist model than to the traditional Orthodox "symphony of powers". This was first pointed out by the Slavophiles in the 1840s, and was reiterated by many of the intelligentsy in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Persuaded by these criticisms, as well as his own deep knowledge and love of pre-Petrine Russia, in 1901 Tsar Nicholas II removed from the Constitution the phrase describing the sovereign as the "Supreme Judge" of the Church. In this way he signalled that he was prepared to undertake a far-ranging reform of Church-State relations, bringing them back to the true "symphony" that had prevailed under the Muscovite tsars. The next step he had in mind was the convening of the first Council of the Russian Orthodox Church since 1667. For whereas the Tsar always viewed liberal developments in politics with suspicion, this was not the case with regard to Church-State relations, where he understood that freeing the Church from the dead hand of the State would ultimately be to the benefit of both Church and State.

However, there was here concealed a great danger that "freedom" for the Church would be understood as part of the democratic revolution that the liberals were calling for. Properly understood, freedom for the Church from the State did not mean the democratization of the Church herself (the Church is not a democracy, but a theocracy, a sui generis mixture of monarchical, oligarchical and democratic elements under the overall rule of God), but her ability to run her own affairs without interference from the secular power. It might entail a certain "freeing up" of the internal structure of the Church at several levels – less bureaucracy generally, more control of bishops over their own dioceses, more independence of parishes to elect their own priests, buy their own property, etc. – but this was not the essence of the matter. The essence of the matter was that, freed from secular control, the Church would be more free to follow her own rules as embodied in the Sacred Canons of the Church, thereby giving more place to *God* to rule His Church in accordance with her real inner nature. The result would be a true renovation of Church life, a release of new streams of vivifying grace into the flagging organism.

Unfortunately, however, the movement for the return of the Church to her canonical norms was seen by many in the Church in the context of the general movement to limit the powers of the Tsar. Thus "on the border of the 19th and 20th centuries right until the February revolution, the representatives of the higher reaches of the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church acted in such a way as to limit the participation of the emperor in ecclesiastical administration and to 'distance' the Church from the State. A confirmation of this is the shortening, from January, 1900, of the commemoration of the emperor at the proskomedia (the initial stage of the liturgy, the central Christian service), and also the shortening, from February, 1901, of the 'loyal allegiance' part of the oath for those being ordained to the episcopate and the removal of the oath for members of the Holy Synod. An indicator of the

striving of the higher reaches of the hierarchy to raise their intra-ecclesiastical status was constituted by the processes taking place at the time of the gradual increase in the liturgical titles of the hierarchs, and also the increase in the commemorations of the diocesan bishops.

"… At the same time the clergy quite demonstratively declined from working out a theological point of view with regard to the power of the tsar. On the whole, it supported the 'rational' estimates that the jurists, political commentators and historians gave to tsarist power. Moreover, there was no clarification of such questions as the ecclesiastical prerogatives of the emperor and the so-called sacred rights of the Anointed of God. Even with regard to whether the anointing of the tsar was a church sacrament or not there was no unity among the hierarchs."[86]

The over-procurator of the time, Constantine Petrovich Pobedonostsev, was strongly opposed to the prevailing liberal currents, and in general to any change in Church-State relations. In fact, as events were to prove, he was more to the "right" on these questions even than his former pupil, Tsar Nicholas. However, in 1901 he was reluctantly forced to allow the convening of a series of 20 religio-philosophical meetings between the "God-seeking" intelligentsia and the clergy in St. Petersburg. This was the idea of D.S. Merezhkovsky, V.V. Rozanov and a Synodal official, V.A. Ternavtsev.

It answered to a definite turning away of a part of the intelligentsia from sixties-style positivism to some kind of religion. As often as not, however, the conversion was not to Orthodoxy but to some vague kind of mysticism or theosophy. Moreover, many of these intellectuals were primarily interested in introducing their liberal political ideas into Church life; they wanted the Church to be renovated, not by slow, cautious reform from above that always remained faithful to the dogmatic and canonical bases of Orthodoxy, but by a revolution from below in which they saw themselves, rather than the bishops or the Tsar, as taking the leading role. Nevertheless, if these "God-seekers" were ever to acquire true Orthodoxy, they needed to encounter the Church in her more learned representatives. Hence the significance of the religio-philosophical meetings, which were chaired by a rising star of the Russian Church, Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky).

"Sergius," writes G.M. Soldatov, "was popular in circles waiting for the introduction of 'democratic' reforms in the State. In his sermons and speeches he criticized the relationship between the ecclesiastical and state authorities in the Russian Empire."[87] This would have been a risky subject to raise only ten years earlier; but times were changing rapidly, and Sergius, as his future career proved, was always sensitive to how the times were changing, and accommodated himself to them accordingly… At the same time he did make

[86] Babkin, op. cit., pp. 2, 3.
[87] Soldatov, "Tolstoj i Sergij: Iude Podobnie" (Tolstoy and Sergius: Images of Judas), *Nasha Strana (Our Country),* N 2786; *Vernost' (Fidelity),* N 32, January 1/14, 2006.

a fair point in the eighth of the religio-philosophical meetings, arguing that only if the State ceased to use the Church as a weapon would it become possible "to raise the question of freedom of conscience. Otherwise it will be only by virtue of indifferentism that the State can give freedom to the sects along with the Church". But "Russian State power cannot be indifferent or atheist if it does not want to renounce itself".[88] In other words: if the State was truly the defender of Orthodoxy, as it claimed, it should free the Church from political tasks and a bondage that was alien to her nature. Otherwise, freedom would simply help the sectarians and atheists to fight against the Church, while she remained unable to defend herself freely. Thus the questions of Church reform and freedom of conscience were inescapably linked…

It was not only liberals like Sergius who favoured Church reform. The former revolutionary-turned-monarchist L.A. Tikhomirov published an article arguing that the State should "give the Church independence and the possibility of being the kind of organization she must be in accordance with *her own* laws, while remaining in union with her".[89] The problem was that both conservatives and liberals could argue for Church reform, but for completely different motives. Tikhomirov wrote as one who had seen the revolution from within, and turned away from it with all his heart, acknowledging the only true defence against it to be the strengthening of Church consciousness among the people. The liberals, on the other hand, were motivated, not by a desire to see the Church free and therefore able to exert a more powerful influence on society, but rather the opposite: a desire to humble the State and destroy the Church's influence once and for all. As for the liberal *bishops* such as Sergius, they leapt onto the band-waggon of the reform of Church-State relations, and of what later came to be called *renovationism*, in order to further their own careers…

[88] Sergius Firsov, *Russkaia Tserkov' nakanune peremen (The Russian Church on the Eve of the Changes)*, Moscow, 2000, p. 117.
[89] Tikhomirov, "Gosudarstvennost' i religia" (Statehood and religion), *Moskovskie Vedomosti (Moscow Gazette)*, March, 1903, p. 3; in Firsov, op. cit., p. 137.

8. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (2) TOLSTOYISM

Another liberal-renovationist cause that Bishop Sergius espoused during the religio-philosophical meetings was the supposed injustice of the novelist Tolstoy's excommunication from the Church.[90] Tolstoy was in essence a Protestant, who stood for a Christianity reduced to "pure" morality without the Church or the sacraments. He not only preached his own Gospel (according to his own translation published in Geneva), and created his own sect: he also subjected the teaching and the sacraments of the Orthodox Church to ridicule, as in his novel *Resurrection*.

Tolstoy was opposed among the clergy especially by St. John of Kronstadt, who wrote of him that he had "corrupted his moral personality to the point of deformity and mortification", and that he had "made himself into a complete savage with regards to the faith and the Church, because of his lack of education in the faith and piety since his youth." St. John appealed for help: "Holy warriors of the heavenly Church, take up arms, take up arms for the Church of God on earth. She, the beloved bride, is impoverished, she suffers from the savage attacks on her from the atheist Lev Tolstoy…"

St. John especially bemoaned Tolstoy's influence on youth: "Our young intelligentsia have subverted the social and educational order, they have taken politics and the law-courts upon themselves without having been called to do so by anyone; they have taken to judging their masters, their teachers, the government and all but kings themselves; together with their head, Lev Tolstoy, they have judged and condemned the universal and fearful Judge Himself… Verily, the day of the dread Judgement is near, for the deviation from God which was foretold has already occurred and the forerunner of the antichrist has already revealed himself, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped."[91]

Tolstoy was the first twentieth-century antichrist in the precise sense of the word (I John 2.22, 4.3; II John 7), and, in Lenin's famous phrase, "the mirror of the Russian revolution". But Bishop Sergius, following the popular trend,

---

[90] The Church had anathematised Tolstoy on February 20-23, 1901 in the following words: "In his writings Count Lev Tolstoy has blasphemed against the holy sacraments, denying their grace-filled character, has not venerated the Orthodox Church as his Church, has spoken evil of the clergy, has said that he considers that to venerate Christ and worship Him as God is blasphemy, while saying of himself, by contrast: 'I am in God, and God in me'. It is not the Church that has rejected him, casting him off from herself, but he himself has rejected the Church: Lev himself has of his own will fallen away from the Church and is no longer a son of the Church, but is hostile to her. All attempts of the clergy to admonish the prodigal have failed to produce the desired fruits: in his pride he has considered himself cleverer than all, less fallible than all and the judge of all, and the Church has made a declaration about the falling away of Count Lev Tolstoy from the Russian Orthodox Church." (Gubanov, op. cit., p. 701).

[91] St. John, in Nadieszda Kizenko, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000, p. 249.

defended him against the decision of his own Synod. Soldatov writes: "Sergius compared Lev Tolstoy to Julian the Apostate, whom, as he said, no council had condemned and who had not been excommunicated, but who was an apostate from Christianity. For that reason, he said, 'it was not necessary to excommunicate Tolstoy, since he himself consciously left the Church'…"[92] After the revolution, Bishop Sergius would become one of the leaders of the pro-communist "Living Church", which restored Tolstoy to communion with the (supposedly) Orthodox Church, and then became the first Soviet patriarch through the mercy of the former seminarian Stalin…

St. John of Kronstadt, a fervent monarchist, was opposed not only to Tolstoy, but also to the whole "proto-renovationist" current in the Church led by Bishop Sergius. "These people," he wrote, "are rejecting the Church, the sacraments, the authority of the clergy and they have even thought up a journal *The New Way* [which published reports on the religio-philosophical meetings in St. Petersburg]. This journal has undertaken to search for God, as if the Lord had not appeared to people and had not revealed the true way. They will find no other way than in Christ Jesus, our Lord. […] It is Satan who reveals all of these new ways and stupid people who don't understand what they are doing and are driving themselves and their nation to ruin by spreading their satanic ideas among the nation."[93]

Fr. John had great influence with the royal family, and the tsar visited him secretly. This influence was noted and feared by a new player in church and court circles – the false elder Gregory Rasputin. As Bishop Theophan (Bystrov), inspector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, later witnessed to an Extraordinary Commission of the Provisional Government in 1917: "Rasputin indicated with unusual skill that he had reservations [about Fr. John]… Rasputin… said of Fr. John of Kronstadt… that he was a saint but, like a child, lacked experience and judgement… As a result Fr. John's influence at court began to wane…" However, Fr. John was supported by the better clergy: for example, by the future metropolitan and hieromartyr Fr. Joseph (Petrovykh), who wrote: "Lack of faith, impiety and all kinds of harmful tendencies are now pouring over Holy Rus' in a still more swollen river. They were restrained by this powerful personality [Fr. John], who was put forward by the Providence of God to oppose the heretic Tolstoy."[94]

With Fr. John's death in 1908, however, the renovationist tide gathered strength again.

---

[92] Soldatov, op. cit.

[93] Robert Bird, "Metropolitan Philaret and the Secular Culture of His Age", in Vladimir Tsurikov (ed.), *Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow 1782-1867,* The Variable Press, USA, 2003, p. 25.

[94] St. Joseph of Petrograd, *In the Father's Bosom: A Monk's Diary,* 3864; in M.S. Sakharov and L.E. Sikorskaya, *Sviaschennomuchenik Iosif Mitropolit Petrogradskij (Hieromartyr Joseph, Metropolitan of Petrograd)*, St. Petersburg, 2006, p. 254.

9. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (3) MONASTICISM

Another arena of conflict between "rightist" church intelligentsy and "leftist" renovationists was *monasticism.* A movement to promote monasticism, not only within monastic walls, but also within the theological academies and seminaries, was led by Bishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky), rector of the Kazan Theological Academy.[95] Many of his pupils were to occupy important posts after the revolution both inside and outside Russia.

Bishop Anthony placed particular emphasis on pastoral theology in the system of higher theological education, and his devotion and love effected a gradual change in the system of education in the direction of a closer and more constant spiritual and moral intercourse between teachers and taught. Almost every day after supper he would arrange tea-parties with the students in his rooms. "On a long table," writes one of the participants, "there stood a samovar and ten to fifteen glasses, with sugar and jam. One of the students would pour out the tea. Over tea a conversation would begin and perplexities would be resolved. Sometimes quarrels would arise. But in general, there were all sorts of people present, and one could learn much."

Another important influence was Bishop Theophan (Bystrov), who became rector of the St. Petersburg Academy in 1909. Vladyka Theophan enlivened the religio-moral atmosphere in the academy and created a whole direction among the students, a kind of school of "Theophanites", as they were called. He tried to instill in the students a respect for the lofty authority of the Holy Fathers of the Church in everything that pertained to Church faith and piety. When replying to a question of a theological or moral character he tried to avoid speaking "from himself", but immediately went to the bookcase and found a precise answer to the question from the Holy Fathers, which allowed his visitor to depart profoundly satisfied. He himself was a walking encyclopaedia of theological knowledge. And yet this was by no means merely book knowledge: because of his ascetic life, he knew the truth of the teachings of the Fathers from his own experience. He would go to all the services, and often spend whole nights in prayer standing in his cell in front of the analoy and the icons. He would even take service books with him on his travels, and read all the daily services.

His very look inspired respect, and soon cases of amazing spiritual perspicacity revealed themselves. Never familiar, always correct and restrained in manner, but at the same time warm and attentive, he was a fierce enemy of all modernism, vulgarity and falsehood. This caused him to have many enemies, but people also involuntarily respected him. Once the famous writer V.V. Rozanov spoke at length to him against monasticism.

[95] Archbishop Nicon (Rklitsky), *Zhizneopisanie Blazhennejshago Antonia, Mitropolita Kievsago i Galitskago (Biography of his Beatitude Anthony, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich),* volume 1, New York: publication of the Washington-Florida diocese, 1971, pp. 144-151.

Vladyka Theophan did not reply with a single word. But his silence was effective, for at the end the writer simply said: *"But perhaps you are right!"*

The debate for and against monasticism also affected Moscow Theological Academy, where the proponents of monasticism, especially Archimandrite Nicon (Rozhdestvensky), the future Hieromartyr Archbishop of Vologda, and Archimandrite Joseph (Petrovykh), the future Hieromartyr Metropolitan of Petrograd, were opposed by several of the secular professors. "This polemic between the professors of the Academy and the steward of the Holy Trinity – St. Sergius Lavra, Archimandrite [later Bishop] Nicon (Rozhdestvensky) began already in 1902 and unfolded on the pages of the journals *Soul-Profiting Reading* and *The Theological Herald*. The professors subjected monasticism in its contemporary form to sharp criticism and called on the monks to carry out in a practical way the commandment of love for one's neighbour in the form of social service. Archimandrite Nicon defended the contemplative character of monasticism. The articles on both sides were quite sharp in character. In March, 1904 Metropolitan Vladimir of Moscow banned an article by the Academy Professor N.F. Kapterev, which was being prepared for the press as a reply to Archimandrite Nicon. On March 18 an extraordinary session of the Academy Council took place for this reason. The decision was taken to protest against the metropolitan's ban. Archimandrite Joseph did not agree with this decision, supported the ban on the publication and expressed himself against N.F. Kapterev's article because of its unbecoming and sharp attacks and even 'the poison of barbs, mockeries and insults directed not only against opponents but also against monasticism itself, but very well concealed under an external mask of objective scholarship'.

"For his words Archimandrite Joseph was publicly and coarsely reproached by the offended N.F. Kapterev, after which he left the meeting. The scene made a bad impression on everyone, but Fr. Joseph was not spared – it was considered that he had received his due for his conceit and his speech against the professorial corporation and one of its most senior members. Professor I.V. Popov in a letter of April 16, 1904 wrote: 'Joseph set off straight from the meeting to the elders at the skete. There he wept and wrote a petition for his retirement…' At Pascha a deputation from the professors was received by Metropolitan Vladimir, who also summoned Archimandrite Joseph. In spite of the warm reception and long conversation with the professors, the ban was not removed, and Kapterev's article was not printed."[96]

In 1909 Metropolitan Vladimir appointed one of Bishop Anthony's pupils at Kazan, Archimandrite Theodore (Pozdeyevsky) as rector of the Moscow Academy, and then consecrated him as Bishop of Volokolamsk. Vladyka Theodore published a work, *The Meaning of Christian Asceticism*, which became a kind of manifesto of the "new wave" of monastics. And after the

[96] Sakharov and Sikorskaya, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

revolution Vladyka's Danilov monastery in Moscow would become one of the power-houses of the Catacomb Church.

Bishop Theodore wrote: "Many contemporary renovators of Christianity think it unnecessary to take account of the true attitude of Christianity towards man, his nature and the meaning of life. They create their own ideal of life and judge Christianity in accordance with that ideal. They want to bring in Christianity as the most suitable, so to speak, most vital factor contributing to the realization of their ideal. The most important thing, the question of sin, is completely ignored by them, and they have no idea what it is. That is why, for example, Merezhkovsky, who accuses Christianity of the split between flesh and spirit that destroyed the pagan world, has no explanation of where this split appeared among the pagans or why they lived by affirming the flesh. But Christianity says that this destructive split and disharmony in the nature of man was not imposed on man from without, but lives within him, as a consequence of sin... This is the corruption, illness and servitude of man to the flesh, and in order to understand what happened in the soul of man through sin it is necessary to penetrated into the psychology of sin. One should point out that, among the representatives of that part of the intelligentsia which is thinking of going along the path of Christianity, this path is indeed new, because, far from wanting to accept Christianity as it is and always was, historically speaking, they want to find - or, better, invent - in this same Christianity certain new ways of incarnating it in life and, through it, of renovating human life... For the man who is used to living in accordance with the ideals of the new philosophy of life, or in accordance with the moods revealed by the philosophy of Nietzsche and the wild heroes of the works of Gorky, L. Andreyev, etc., it is of course not easy immediately to accept Christianity in its historical integrity, and such people find much in the teaching of the Christian Church that is as strange as it is incomprehensible. The Apostle Paul said that the preaching of Christ crucified appeared as very strange and difficult to accept: for some it was simply a deception, and for others - sheer madness... This same teaching about Christ, crucified and suffering, this demand that man should crucify his passions and lusts, this Christianity imbued with the spirit of compunction and the suppression of the carnal principle in the name of spiritual interests - in a word: the ascetical spirit of Christianity has disturbed the new pagans who seek in the Christianity the truth of life (as they understand it, of course) and has become a stone of stumbling and fall in the task of following Christ. Open the pages of any work of Merezhkovsky, Minsky or Rozanov, and you will see that their articles are mainly occupied with a criticism of monasticism, which is identified with asceticism. This strange phenomenon is the result of the fact that a part of the intelligentsia which is seeking God has approached Christianity with the very definite aim of reforming it, which is nothing other than the same decadence applied to the religious life…"

"The proponents of the idea that ascetics should do public service make the direct demand that the antiquated institution of monasticism should be reformed by turning monasteries into associations and congregations with a

predominantly practical significance. Among secular writers, Merezhkovsky, for example, in his article 'The Last Saint', directly states that 'the whole of ancient eastern and Russian asceticism is imbued with the spirit of hatred and disdain for society'. Berdyaev for some reason represents asceticism as rejoicing in the existence of diabolical evil in the world, for if this evil did not exist, where would ascetics go in their search for reasons to suffer? This is an example of the contemporary misunderstanding of the nature and meaning of Christian asceticism..."[97]

[97] St. Theodore, *The Meaning of Christian Asceticism*.

10. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA: (4) THE NEW THEOLOGY

We see, then, that the ferment in political and social life was matched by a scarcely less varied, if less violent, ferment of opinions and movements in Church life. On the one hand, we see the conservative churchmen such as St. John of Kronstadt and Bishops Anthony (Khrapovitsky), Theophan (Bystrov), Nicon (Rozhdestvensky), Joseph (Petrovykh) and Theodore (Pozdeyevsky). And on the other we see the renovationists such as Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) and "the new pagans", such as Tolstoy, Merezhkovsky, Rozanov, Bulgakov and Berdyaev. These debates were to become more rather than less important in the course of time. For it would be largely along the lines drawn in these pre-revolutionary decades that the Church schisms of the post-revolutionary period would develop.

In addition, we should note a current of thought that arose among certain Church conservatives against what was seen to be the dead scholasticism of the contemporary teaching of theology in Russia. A conventional target was the Metropolitan of Moscow Macarius (Bulgakov)'s *Dogmatic Theology,* which, while a splendid handbook for quotations from the Holy Fathers, was considered by many to be lacking in inspiration. Thus Professor Nicholas Glubokovsky, while not denying that the virtues of Macarius' book were "undoubted and huge", nevertheless argued that "the author is dragged towards the past, lives by its traditions and is governed by former methods. For him dogma is a finished theoretical formula that is undeniably obligatory in its abstract, irrefutable completedness. In this case only one scientific operation is permitted in relation to it – the establishment of its truth by the logically interrelated connections of all its parts the crushing force of its external arguments. Hence the whole construction inevitably acquires the character of a priori dryness and bookish lifelessness, and the scientific exposition turns out to be directly scholastic…"[98]

Fairly typical of this tendency was the former Tolstoyan and future hieromartyr-bishop of the Catacomb Church, Michael Alexandrovich Novoselov. He advocated a more living, experiential approach to theology in general and anti-heretical polemics in particular. "Our school theology," he wrote, "on the soil of which the struggle against the opponents of the Church is waged, is foreign to religious experience and not only inspires nobody and brings nobody to God, but even kills the living shoots of religious life which are apprehended in the pious family and in church. The disgust or distrust which theology elicits in many alumni of our theological (and sometimes also secular) educational institutions is hardly a secret to anyone. Indifference to the faith or its rejection – that is our heritage.

[98] Glubokovsky, *Russkaia bogoslovskaia nauka v ee istoricheskom razvitii i novejshem sostoianii (Russian theological science in its historical development and contemporary condition),* Moscow: St. Vladimir Brotherhood, 2002; http:proroza.narod.ru/Glubokovsky.htm, p. 2.

"Look: who rules the mind and the aroused conscience of the Russian man? Literature, philosophy, science – only not theology, which in its extreme schematism decisively refuses to see the living human soul with its demands, torments and doubts. It does not take the man with his present spiritual requirements and does not raise him, cautiously and penetratingly, to a higher level of self-knowledge and self-feeling. This role secular literature has taken upon itself, although unfortunately it is not always in agreement with Christian ideals.

"Who has good success with us in the purely religious sphere? Vladimir Soloviev, Khomiakov, Samarin, Kireevsky, Nesmelov - that is, people who are particularly foreign to the methods of school theologising.

"How do such spiritual writers (who, however, are significant more for those who are not yet far from the Church, and still more those living in it) such as Bishop Theophan, Bishop Anthony of Ufa, Fr. John Sergiev (I have in mind his book, *My Life in Christ*) attract people to themselves? By renouncing the stereotypical, the dead and the deadening, the formal-dialectical method of thinking. They have gone along a new path of theological thought, a path which, it would seem, should most accurately be called 'psychological'…"[99]

The call for a more living approach to theology was not, of course, wrong in itself. However, it contained potential dangers. One was that "exciting" but heretical theologians (Novoselov mentions Vladimir Soloviev) were preferred to "boring" but Orthodox ones like Metropolitan Macarius. Another was that false diagnoses of the causes of Russian theology's supposed "deadness" were offered. As, for example, that it was not Russian enough. Thus, as Protopriest Valentine Asmus writes, "Professor M.M. Tareev of the Moscow Theological Academy tried to demonstrate that Russian Orthodoxy had to cast off the yoke of Byzantine asceticism, which had dried up the Russian religious genius. A vivid representative of 'the national theology' was Tareev's colleague, Vladimir Alexeevich Troitsky, in monasticism Hilarion (he was ordained to the episcopate after the revolution). He shared the ambiguity of Slavophilism, which well understood the universal meaning of Christianity and at the same time was inclined to see in Orthodoxy 'the wealth of tribal faith' (Khomiakov), as if it were naturally inherent in the Russians and Slavs as a whole. 'The spirit of Slavdom is defined by Orthodoxy' (Troitsky, *The Church as a Union of Love*, Moscow, 1998, p. 333). 'I always somehow feel a lie in the position of the Slav Catholic'. Everything specifically Catholic 'must be extremely opposed to the Slavic soul. The betrayal of Orthodoxy is… the betrayal of Slavdom, a going over to a western key in mood and in life' (this was said about the Poles, p. 334). The remarkable thought of Tertullian that the human soul is by nature Christian is here narrowed to a single tribe taken on its own. The Russian man even in the fall preserves such natural resources

[99] Novoselov, "Zabytij put' opytnogo Bogopoznania" (The Forgotten Path of the Experiential Knowledge of God), 1902, Vyshnij Volochek; http://catacomb.org.ua/modules.php?name=Pages&go=print_page&pid=653.

as are not to be found in others, and even flirting with the devil is for him child's play. 'The German has sold his soul to the devil, but the Russian has given it away in such way that – and in this is the undoubted superiority of the Russian – he can leave the devil, while the German has nothing with which to redeem himself' (p. 115)."[100]

Another danger was that the perception was created, whether justly or unjustly, that the reformers were striving to form an elite within the Church that would gradually replace the old cadres. Bishop Anthony in particular was seen as trying to create a core body of learned monks who would replace the old professorial cadres. Thus, "recalling the 1890s, [Professor] N.N. Glubokovsky used to remark that it was precisely at that time that [there arose] the artificial development of a new monasticism, which created a special 'direction' in the Russian Church that announced and practised 'in the spirit of true churchliness' that 'everything is permitted, allowed and forgiven to monks'. Later, wrote Glubokovsky, 'there developed tendentious agitation for the monastic tonsure to be declared one of the sacraments, and if there were meant to be no more than seven, then it was necessary to dethrone marriage and put monasticism in its place, which would serve God following the example of the redemption on the Cross "through the compassionate love" of Christ alone…'[101]

Glubovsky is here referring to Bishop Anthony's controversial theory of redemption, according to which Christ saved us simply through the power of His compassionate love and not through offering any kind of "expiation" or "satisfaction" of God's justice. This product of the new, "living" theology, which was shared by other leading theologians such as Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) and Archimandrite Hilarion (Troitsky), bordered on heresy, and was to cause major arguments. Thus one of the earliest critics of Bishop Anthony was the future Hieromartyr Archbishop Victor of Vyatka. He noted already in 1912 that the "new theology" of Bishops Anthony and Sergius "would shake the Church". Later, after Sergius issued his pro-Soviet "Declaration" of 1927, which caused a huge schism in the Russian Church, Archbishop Victor saw in the "Declaration" a direct result of Sergius' pre-revolutionary teaching on salvation…[102]

---

[100] Asmus, "Arkhiepiskop Ilarion Troitskij i Pravoslavnoe Bogoslovie" (Archbishop Hilarion Troitsky and Orthodox Theology)", *Bogoslovskij Sbornik (Theological Anthology),* issue 7, Moscow, 2001; http://proroza.narod.ru/Asmus-1.htm, p. 1.

[101] Firsov, op. cit., p. 91.

[102] Hieromartyr Victor, "Novie Bogoslovy" (The New Theologians), *Tserkov'* (The Church), 1912; reprinted by Orthodox Action, Moscow, N 1 (11), 2000; Protopriest Michael Polsky, *Novie Mucheniki Rossijskie* (The New Martyrs of Russia)), 1949-57, Jordanville, vol. 1, p. 601.

11. THE SAROV DAYS

Dark clouds were gathering over the Orthodox world: assassinations of ministers in Russia, violence between Russians and Jews in Kishinev, the murder of the King and Queen of Serbia in Belgrade… But before the storm God granted a last great feast of light to strengthen the faithful: the canonization of St. Seraphim of Sarov. "It was a long time ago, July 19, 1903. Then Great Russia – Holy Orthodox Rus' – was still alive, powerful and glorious. Then there sat on the Russian throne the Tsar, the Anointed of God; then the great Russian people was free and was peacefully carrying out its difficult historical task. It was an unforgettable time. A time of great and radiant hopes. It seemed to all that the 20th century would be a time of peace, of fruitful work and the flourishing of all peoples. Then there was a common dream that stirred everybody, both old and young. It was at this time of great expectations and radiant hopes that it was pleasing to the Lord to send to Russia great joy, to allow the great Russian people to experience the radiant days of the Sarov Festivities."[103]

The glorification of the most revered of Russia's saints, Seraphim of Sarov, was undertaken at the insistence of the Tsar himself.[104] As Archpriest Lev Lebedev writes: "From 1895 to 1901 four daughter were born to the Tsar and Tsarina: Great Princesses Olga, Tatiana, Maria and Anastasia. But an Heir was needed! Because of the absence of an Heir complications arose in the official definition of the order of succession to the Throne. From the end of the 19th century and in the first years of the 20th, there was a sharp increase in students' and workers' disturbances. Under the influence of revolutionaries the workers' strikes and demonstrations acquired not only an economic, but also a political character. Terrorist parties appeared again, and the murders of state functionaries began. In such a situation, clarity in the matter of the succession of tsarist power was more necessary than ever – an Heir was needed! It seemed that for a pair who had had four daughters this could happen only by a miracle, since medical means did not help. Various people renowned for the gift of healing were invited, beginning with natives ones (certain 'blessed' ones) and ending with foreigners such as the Frenchman Philippe. But nobody was able to help. The thought arose that a miracle could take place through the intercession of St. Seraphim of Sarov, whose glorification, on the initiative of the Tsar, was already being prepared.

---

[103] Protopriest Basil Boschansky, "Sarovskie Torzhestva" (Sarov Festivities), *Pravoslavnij Put'* (The Orthodoxy Way), 2003, Jordanville: Holy Trinity Monastery, pp. 1-2.

[104] The original initiative for the canonization came from Blessed Pasha of Sarov, who said to Archimandrite Seraphim: "Send a request to the Tsar that they open the relics for us. "Chichagov began to collect materials", wrote the *Diveyevo Chronicle*, "and brought it to the Tsar. When the Tsar read it, he became inflamed with the desire to uncover the relics… The Emperor insisted on the glorification, but almost the entire Synod was against it. It was supported only by the future Metropolitan Cyril and the Ober-Procurator Vladimir Carlovich Sabler. The others protested, 'Why should we go off to the woods? They only found bones.'" (Nun Seraphima (Bulgakova), "The Diveyevo Tradition", in Helen Kontzevitch, *Saint Seraphim, Wonderworker of Sarov,* Wildwood, Ca.: St. Xenia Skete, 2004, p. 237).

"The Royal Family had known about the great Wonderworker of the Russian Land for a long time. But a particular impression was made on the Tsar and Tsarina by the book *A Chronicle of the Seraphimo-Diveyevo Women's Monastery*, written and given personally to Nicholas II by Archimandrite Seraphim (Chichagov) – a scion of a noble family, one of the most educated and talented representatives of the nobility, who wanted to exchange a military career for monastic asceticism… In the *Chronicle* there were so many teachings, words of the holy elder of Sarov, prophecies, information about his miracles that the Royal Family was inspired with great faith in him! The triumphant glorification of Seraphim of Sarov, who had already been widely venerated in the people for a long time, was appointed from July 17-20, 1903. The Tsar came to Sarov with his whole family, his mother, the widowed Empress Maria Fyodorovna, his brothers, the Great Princes, other members of the Imperial House, and his suite. The Royal Family had never undertaken such a pilgrimage before. It was unlike any of the other journeys undertaken by the Tsar and Tsaritsa to holy places. Up to 300,000 worshippers from every corner of Russia assembled in Sarov for those days. Nicholas II tried to be present at all the long, almost unending services. The peak of the festivities was the transfer of the relics of St. Seraphim from the monastery's hospital church of SS. Zosimas and Sabbatius, where he had been buried, into the Dormition cathedral of the Sarov community on July 18. The coffin with the relics was borne on their shoulders by the Tsar, the Great Princes and the hierarchs, tightly surrounded by a sea of people."[105]

The festivities were truly an icon of Holy Russia: the Royal Family and the Great Princes mixed with thousands of peasants in the true, unforced union that only the true worship of God and the veneration of His saints can produce. Many miracles of healing took place, and those who were present witnessed to the extraordinary spiritual peace and joy that was granted the worshippers. "Something unseen and unheard took place. Russian Tsar and his Family were for several days in immediate prayerful union with hundreds of thousands (!) of Russian people, praying together with them, in their very heart. The secret police were as it were dissolved in this mass; in fact, there was essentially no need for its presence! It was truly 'with one heart and one mouth' that the Orthodox people glorified God, the God-pleaser Seraphim and God's Anointed, Tsar Nicholas II!... *Such* a meeting with Holy Russia, represented by *such a multitude of the people* and with the breathing of *the special grace of God*, bound up with the glorification of St. Seraphim of Sarov, turned out to be *the first* for the Royal Couple and… *the last*…

"The Sarov days of 1903 became *a key event in the whole reign.* During the festivities the Tsar received from the widow of P.A. Motovilov a letter of St. Seraphim of Sarov addressed *precisely to him*, Nicholas II ['to the Tsar in whose reign I shall be glorified'], 'sealed (but never opened!) with the soft part of a piece of bread. The Tsar read the letter and his face changed, and

[105] Lebedev, op. cit., pp. 388-389.

after reading it… he wept (neither before nor after this did anyone see him in tears). To this day nobody knows what was in the letter. We can guess that it contained some kind of prophecy about his destiny, or the destiny of Russia.[106] In the same period Nicholas II visited the fool-for-Christ Pasha of Sarov… She symbolically (by means of a doll) foretold to the Tsar *the birth of a son*, and spoke much with him in figurative language. The Tsar left amazed and joyful: 'I have travelled across the whole of Russia and have not met such a saint. Everyone has received me as Tsar, but she as a simple person,' he said. Pasha placed the portrait of Nicholas II in her prayer corner and made many prostrations to the earth in front of it, which greatly exhausted her cell-attendants who used to lift and lower Pasha since she could not make prostrations herself because of illness. 'Matushka, why are you praying to the Tsar?!' they asked. 'You know nothing,' replied the blessed one. 'He will be higher than all the Tsars.' When war began in 1914 Pasha, covered in tears, began to kiss the feet of the Tsar on the portrait, saying: 'Dear one, it is already near the end,' and sent him the message: '*Your Majesty, come down from the Throne yourself*'…

"The visit to Sarov quickly produced results: On July 30 / August 12, 1904 the Heir to the Throne Alexis Nikolayevich was born! We can imagine the joy of the Crown-Bearing Parents! In the first months of the life of the new-born it was still not known what a terrible disease nestled in him He looked completely health, he was simply a beautiful child…

"Now we can understand how the thought of the Tsar about the return of Russia to the pre-Petrine foundations of life were linked into one with the impressions and feeling that arose in the Royal Couple in the Sarov days…"[107]

One of the foundations of pre-Petrine Russia had been the institution of the patriarchate, which Peter the Great had abolished. According to the witness of Sergius Nilus, it was some months later, when still under the joyful impressions of the Sarov days, and shortly after the birth of the Tsarevich,

---

[106] Already early in the nineteenth century the Prophet Abel had prophesied to Tsar Paul I: 'Nicholas II will be a holy tsar, like Job the much-suffering. He will have the mind of Christ, patience and dove-like purity. The Scriptures speak about him: Psalms 90, 10 and 20 have revealed to me the whole of his destiny. He will exchange a royal crown for a crown of thorns, will be betrayed by his people as was once the Son of God. He will be a redeemer, he will redeem his people, like the bloodless sacrifice. There will be a war, a great war, a world war. People will fly through the air like birds, and swim under the water like fish, they will begin to exterminate each other with evil-smelling sulphur. On the eve of victory the Russian throne will collapse. But the betrayal will grow and multiply. And your great-grandson will be betrayed, many of your descendants will also whiten their garments in the blood of the Lamb, the peasant will seize power with his axe in madness, but he himself will later weep. A truly Egyptian punishment will begin… Blood and tears will soak the wet earth. Rivers of blood will flow. Brother will rise up against brother. And again: fire, the sword, invasions of aliens and the inner enemy of the godless authority. The Jew will beat the Russian land with a scorpion, he will take hold of her holy things, close the churches of God and execute the best Russian people. This will be allowed by God, it will be the wrath of the Lord against Russia for her rejection of the Anointed of God…" (Monk Abel, in Gubanov, op. cit., p. 30).

[107] Lebedev, op. cit., p. 390.

that the Tsar suggested to the Holy Synod that the patriarchate be restored with himself as patriarch, while his wife and brother ruled the country until his son came of age. His offer was declined.[108]

[108] Nilus, *Na beregu Bozh'ej reki. Zapiski pravoslavnago (On God's River. Notes of an Orthodox),* Platina, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1969, vol. II, pp. 181-183). For somewhat different accounts of the meeting of the Tsar and the Synod, see Bishop Dionysius (Alferov) of Novgorod, "Ob uderzhanii i symphonii", http://www.monarhist-spb.narod.ru/D-ST/dionisy-1.htm, p. 15; E.E. Alferev, op. cit., pp. 88-93; M.V. Danilushkin (ed.), *Istoria Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi (*A History of the Russian Church*), 1917-1970,* Saint Petersburg, 1997, pp. 67-69.

12. THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

On February 8, 1904 the Japanese navy launched a surprise attack on the Russian fleet stationed at Port Arthur on the Pacific coast. In April Japan widened the war by crossing the Yalu River into Russian-occupied Manchuria. After a series of victories on land and on sea, the Japanese began a long siege of Port Arthur and succeeded in taking the city in January, 1905. This was followed, in May, by the Battle of Tsushima, in which the Russians lost 5000 sailors killed with 6000 captured, while only 117 Japanese sailors died.[109] Russia was defeated, and sued for peace. At Portsmouth, USA, in September, 1905, thanks to the very tough negotiating stance of Tsar Nicholas, skilfully carried out by Count Sergius Witte, favourable terms were won for Russia.[110] Nevertheless, the loss of prestige was great, and gave renewed encouragement to the revolutionaries.

The Russo-Japanese war is the first instance of a phenomenon that was to be of major importance in 1917: the financing of Russia's enemies by American Jews. Archpriest Lev Lebedev asserts that "Japan would never have risked attacking Russia herself if she had not been specially *incited* to it by England and the U.S.A.

"At the end of 1903 the American Jewish banker Jacob Schiff, Morgan and also 'First National Bank' and 'National City Bank' loaned Japan 30 million dollars so that she should attack Russia.[111] On January 27, 1904, *without declaring war,* Japanese ships treacherously attacked the Russian squadron in Port Arthur (on the Lyaodun peninsula in China, where Russia had built a powerful naval base on leased land). The war began which, according to the plans of its inspirers, was bound to be accompanied *by a revolution in Russia.* The military actions developed in a direction unfavourable to Russia. The suddenness of the attack gave Japan many advantages. If all Russia's military forces in the Far East did not exceed 100,000 men, Japan moved up an army of 300,000. Japan's numerical and, to a certain degree, technical superiority

---

[109] Frank Furedi, "The Rise of the Rising Sun", *BBC History Magazine,* vol. 6, N 9, September, 2005, p. 49.

[110] Perhaps not realizing how advantageous the terms were for the Russians, or perhaps realizing that such concessions had to be made because the Russians would have won if war had continued, the Grand Orient of France congratulated the mediator in the peace negotiations, American President Theodore Roosevelt (a Freemason since 1901) in the following telegram: "The Grand Orient of France has the honour to address to you its warmest congratulations for the outstanding service you have just offered to mankind. Masonry is happy to see the triumph, thanks to one of its eminent sons, of the principles of peace and brotherhood." On September 4, Secretary of State Loomis, wrote back on behalf of the president, thanking the French Masons. As O.F. Soloviev points out, this direct exchange between the Grand Orient and the American president was unprecedented, and showed the increasing influence of Continental Masonry in world affairs (*Masonstvo v Mirovoj Politike XX Veka* (Masonry in the World Politics of the 20th Century), Moscow, 1998, p. 45).

[111] In all he loaned $200 million to Japan during the war, while preventing other firms from lending to Russia (A.I. Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti Let Vmeste (Two Hundred Years Together)*, Moscow, 2001, volume 1, p. 347). (V.M.)

allowed her to win a series of major victories over the Russian armies. The fortress of Port Arthur fell [in January, 1905] after a lengthy and heroic siege. In other battles at Mukden near Lyaoyan in Manchuria, the Russians were also defeated, and retreated. In the naval battles the Russians more than once defeated the Japanese. But… in [May,] 1905, in the Korean bay of Tsushima, the second Russian squadron under Admiral Rozhdestvensky, which had come from the Gulf of Finland through all the seas and oceans to the place of its destruction, was almost completely annihilated. But here, too, non-Japanese forces inimical to Russia helped… While 'Rozhdestvensky's squadron was accomplishing its gigantic voyage as if in the light of a torch lighting up the whole world', wrote the newspaper *Novoe Vremia (New Times)*, 'nobody knew about the movements of the Japanese naval forces even in the ports of China'. The Japanese information services were actively *helped by the Jews.* Some of them acted as spies in the Russian army, others tried to demoralize it, which is witnessed by the commander-in-chief of the armies in the Far East, General Kuropatkin. In 1906 the well-known journalist M.O. Menshikov wrote in the same *Novoe Vremia*: 'The last terrible war… was armed with the most active participation of the Jews. In order to thrust Japan against Russia, it was necessary to arrange for Japan not only external loans, but also the most ardent sympathy [for Japan] in America and England. This sympathy, as has now been established beyond doubt, was artificially stirred up in the American press, which almost completely in Jewish hands. In the course of a whole series of years an army of Jewish hacks has slandered Russia, poured an unbelievably dirty torrent of abuse on her, and stirred people up to hate and despise everything Russian. As a result public opinion, and not only in America, was confused. The huge reading world was pitifully deceived…' At the height of the war the Paris newspaper *Presse* noted: 'Japan has not been waging war against Russia alone. She has a powerful ally – Jewry.' …"[112]

However, Russia lost not only, and not mainly, because of the enmity of the Jews but because of the enmity of the Russians, the huge fifth column of anti-monarchist Russians within the country. Thus "at the end of 1904, on the eve of the preparation of a general attack against the Japanese army near Lyaodun, strikes began in the major Russian military factories and on the railways, which left the Russian army without ammunition and food and allowed the Japanese to take back the initiative. The first defeats of the Russian army elicited the genuine joy of the liberals and a flow of congratulations on this score to the emperor of Japan… With regard to the surrender to the Japanese at Port Arthur his Majesty Emperor Nicholas II organized a government judicial inquiry, since there were no military reasons for the capitulation."[113]

[112] Lebedev, op. cit., pp. 417-418.
[113] Review of A.M. Khitrov, O.L. Solomina, *Khram-pamiatnik v Briussele* (The Memorial Church in Brussels), Moscow, 2005, *Pravoslavnaia Rus'*, N 24, December 15/28, 2005, p. 14.

If we seek still deeper, spiritual reasons for Russia's defeat we may go back to an event that took place during the Boxer rebellion in 1900. During the rebellion, certain Russian military commanders in Blagoveschensk on the Amur had driven some thousands of Chinese out of the city and into the river. This showed that Russia had begun to be infected by the racist and imperialist spirit of the pseudo-Christian West.

She would bear her punishment for it in the Russo-Japanese war only a few years later. This was indicated by Bishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Ufa, who "was profoundly saddened by this event and foretold that it was precisely there, in the Far East, that we were bound to await the special punishment of God. The text of this prophecy has unfortunately not been found, but Vladyka Anthony himself spoke about it in his sermon before the service at the conclusion of peace with Japan [in 1905]. Pointing to the fact that the unsuccessful war with Japan was God's punishment for the apostasy of Russian society from the age-old foundations of Russian life, Vladyka Anthony said: '… I will speak about the fact that it is not only the traitors of the fatherland that are guilty before God, I will say what I said five years ago, when I foretold that it would be precisely there, in the Far East, that we had to expect a particular punishment of God. But I will speak not with evil joy, as do our enemies, but with sadness and with shame, as a Christian and a Russian priest. In Blagoveschensk, on the Amur, five years ago, we permitted a cruel action to take place. Several thousand Chinese, who were in service to Russian citizens, for the general security of the latter, were deceitfully led out of the city and forced into the river, where they found inescapable death… It was not for this that the Lord opened up before us the confines of the Far East, from the Volga to the sea of Okhotsk, so that we amazed the foreigners by our heartlessness. On the contrary, it is there, in the East, and not in the West, that lies the missionary and even messianic calling of our people. Russians did not want to understand this calling – not simple people, of course, but people who consider themselves enlightened, who, following the example of their western enlighteners, would not allow themselves the slightest rudeness in relation to any European rascal, but do not consider humble, straightforward and industrious inhabitants of the East even to be people. We were bound to reveal to them Christ, we were bound to show them the Russian breadth of spirit, Russian love of man, Russian trustingness, but we showed them only animal self-preservation that does not stop before anything. This is our first guilt, for God even in the Old Testament imputed the sinful fall of a people's military commanders to the whole people…'"[114]

The war with Japan caused particular problems for the Russian Orthodox Mission in Japan, headed by Archbishop Nicholas (Kasatkin). A peasant from Smolensk province, St. Nicholas first went to Japan in 1861. Encouraged to learn Japanese by St. Innocent, enlightener of Alaska, he began an astonishingly successful mission that brought tens of thousands of native

[114] Archbishop Nicon (Rklitsky), *Zhizneopisanie Blazhennejshago Antonia, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galitskago,* volume 2, New York, 1957, pp. 140-141.

Japanese to the faith and aroused the admiration of all, including the Japanese.[115] In July, 1882 he presided over the first All-Japanese Orthodox Council. A delegation from Peking was also present, including several churchmen who were later martyred during the Boxer Uprising in 1900.[116]

On the eve of the Russo-Japanese war, "alarmed by the possibility of war with their co-religionists, the Orthodox Japanese turned to their bishop. He replied that they, like all Japanese, were obliged by their oath to carry out their military duty, but to fight was not at all the same as to hate one's enemy, but means to defend one's fatherland. The Saviour Himself bequeathed patriotism to us when He sorrowed over the lot of Jerusalem. The archpastor himself decided to stay in Japan with his flock, even if there was a war… And it began in February 1904. Then Bishop Nicholas handed over all ecclesiastical affairs to the council of priests, and himself served his last liturgy before the war. At the end of the service in his farewell sermon to his flock he called on it to pray for victory for their fatherland, but he, as a subject of the Russian Emperor, could not take part in the common service; but he would be happy to see his flock carrying out their duty. In his encyclical of February 11, 1904, Bishop Nicholas blessed the Japanese to carry out their duty, not sparing their lives, but reminded them that our fatherland is the Church, where all Christians constitute one family; he told them to pray for the re-establishment of peace and asked for mercy to prisoners of war. After this he shut himself away and gave himself over to exploits of prayer…

"Nobody in Russia understood the hierarch of Japan as well as Emperor Nicholas II. At the end of the war the Tsar wrote to him: 'You have shown before all that the Orthodox Church of Christ is foreign to worldly dominion and every tribal hatred, and embraces all tribes and languages with her love. In the difficult time of the war, when the weapons of battle destroy peaceful relations between peoples and rulers, you, in accordance with the command of Christ, did not leave the flock entrusted to you, and the grace of love and faith gave you strength to endure the fiery trial and amidst the hostility of war to keep the peace of faith and love in the Church created by your labours…'"[117]

Archbishop Nicholas' noble affirmation, in word and deed, of the primacy of faith over politics did not go unappreciated. Michael Van Remortel writes: "In the very midst of home front hostility in 1904, the Japanese publisher Aisui Nakagawa wrote and distributed a laudatory profile of Bishop Nikolai… [After the war], in respect of Vladyka Nikolai's efforts on behalf of Russian prisoners, he was awarded the Order of St. Alexander Nevsky by Tsar Nicholas II. In April 1906, the Holy Synod elevated him to the dignity of Archbishop; at that point, the Harisutosu Orthodox Church of Japan became

[115] See Michael Van Remortel & Dr. Peter Chang (eds.), *St. Nikolai Kasatkin and the Orthodox Mission in Japan,* Point Reyes Station, Ca.: Divine Ascent Press, 2003.
[116] http://www.orthodox.cn/history/martyrs/188207jpcouncil_en.htm.
[117] *Pravoslavnaia Zhizn'* (Orthodox Life), 1982; in Sergius and Tamara Fomin, *Rossia pered Vtorym Prishestivem* (Russia before the Second Coming), volume I, Moscow, 1998, p. 372.

an independent jurisdiction within the Russian Orthodox Church. In 1907, another diocese was created in western Japan, with its cathedra at Kyoto…

"… An ecumenical assembly of American bishops voted Archbishop Nikolai the most outstanding Christian evangelist in the entire world…"[118]

St. Nicholas' death in 1912 was covered by all the newspapers of Japan. Very rarely in any age has a Christian so won the hearts of a pagan people, especially one that was at war with his homeland…[119] His life witnessed in the most vivid way that Christianity, while supporting true patriotism, is a *universalist* religion which always places the universalist message of the Gospel above the interests of any individual State or nation.

[118] Von Remartel, op. cit., pp. 19, 20.
[119] Von Remartel, op. cit., p. 192.

13. THE FALL OF THE REACTIONARIES

On January 22, 1905 some hundreds of demonstrating workers were killed by tsarist troops in St. Petersburg while the Tsar himself was away - a tragic event that was used by the intelligenty and revolutionaries as an excuse to undermine the faith of the masses in the Tsar. Ostensibly, the demonstration was about working conditions. In fact, its aims were political. Thus in the petition composed by the demonstration's leader, the priest Fr. George Gapon, he, together with his revolutionary friends, demanded, among other things: an amnesty for political prisoners, a government responsible to the people, the separation of the Church and State, a progressive income tax, the abolition of redemption payments from the peasants, an end to the war, the creation of elected trade unions and the abolition of the factory inspectorate. Moreover, there is evidence that the first shots were fired, not by the soldiers, but by the demonstrators. [120]

At least two thousand people were killed on Bloody Sunday. The Tsar "appeared in the Winter Palace only on January 11 and on the same day received a deputation of workers who repented to him that they had allowed themselves to be drawn into an anti-government provocation. His Majesty mercifully forgave them all and gave to each family of those who suffered an allowance equivalent to half a year's pay of a highly qualified worker. The police measures of the governments of the western countries, and especially the USA, at the beginning of the 20th century, to break up strikes and demonstrations led to far larger numbers of victims. It is sufficient to recall the shooting of the First of May strikers in Chicago and other cities in America, but democratically-inclined journalists prefer to keep silent about these facts."[121]

On February 4, 1905 Great Prince Sergius Alexandrovich Romanov was murdered by revolutionaries. He was killed by a bomb that exploded almost at the doorstep of the palace he and Grand Duchess Elizabeth inhabited in the Kremlin.

At that moment the grand duchess was leaving for her workshops. She was alarmed by the sound of an exploding bomb nearby. Hurrying toward the place (near the Chudov monastery in the Kremlin), she saw a soldier stretching his military overcoat over the maimed body of her husband. The soldier tried to hide the horrible sight from the eyes of the unfortunate wife. But the grand duchess dropped to her knees, on the street, and put her arms out trying to embrace the torn remains of her husband. The bomb had shattered his body to such an extent that fingers of the great prince were found, still in their gloves, on the roof of the neighbouring building. From that time on, the grand duchess refused the food she was accustomed to, and

[120] Nicholas Kazantsev, "Provokator Gapon kak Znamia Perekrestyshej" (The Provocateur Gapon as a Banner for Turn-Coats), *Nasha Strana (Our Country),* July 14, 2006, N 2799.
[121] Khitrov and Solomina, op. cit.

vegetables and bread became her daily nourishment, even before she took her monastic vows.

The lofty spirit in which she took the tragedy astounded everyone; she had the moral strength even to visit in prison her husband's assassin, Kaliayev, hoping to soften his heart with her Christian forgiveness.

"Who are you?" he asked upon meeting her.

"I am his widow," she replied, "Why did you kill him?"

"I did not want to kill you," he said. "I saw him several times before when I had the bomb with me, but you were with him and I could not bring myself to touch him."

"You did not understand that by killing him you were killing me," she said.

Then she began to talk to him of the horror of his crime before God. The Gospel was in her hands and she begged the criminal to read it and left it in his cell. Leaving the prison, the Grand Duchess said:

"My attempt was unsuccessful, but, who knows, perhaps at the last minute he will understand his sin and repent."

She then besought the tsar for clemency for him. And the emperor was ready to bestow it provided the bomber did not refuse it. He refused it…

On the memorial cross erected upon the site of her husband's death, the grand-duchess inscribed the Gospel words: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do..."

*

In November, 1904 a report sponsored by the Minister of the Interior, Prince P.D. Sviatopolk-Mirsky, suggested important changes in a liberal direction in both Church and State. "Among the changes suggested in it," writes Sergius Firsov, "was the re-establishment of the Orthodox parish as a special church-social institution, which had been undermined 'by the Time of Troubles in the Church and the growing development of serfdom'. Mirsky also intended to bring the activity of the church-parish trusts closer to the public administration, 'turning the parish communities into a powerful force in defining the direction of activity of the zemstvos and cities, using their huge numbers and their rights as juridical persons, and consequently the possibility of [their] possessing property'. Unfortunately, these suggestions remained only on paper, [for] after all the reform of the parish in the interests of the State required first of all the reform of Church-State relations and changes in the whole structure of Orthodox administration.

"But in the given instance it is important to not something else: the parish problem was viewed in the general context of the reforms, the chief of which was the introduction of popular representation in one or another form in combination with an autocratic form of government. In accordance with custom, to the report of the minister was attached the project of an ukaz that he wanted discussed. With this aim he obtained permission from the sovereign for the convening of a conference at which all the ministers, including C.P. Pobedonostsev, were present, the presidents of the departments of the State Council the chiefs of the imperial chancelleries and several influential courtiers. Later during the work of the conference, which opened on December 2, there also took part the great princes – the Tsar's uncles Vladimir, Alexis, Michael and Sergius Alexandrovich. Finally the president of the Committee of Ministers, S.Yu. Witte, was able to seize the initiative from Mirsky and attain the signing of the ukaz in a form acceptable to the Tsar – without the point about elections. On December 12 the ukaz 'On Plans for the Perfecting of State Order' was signed, and two days later it appeared in the press.

"It should have fallen to the Committee of Ministers to work out a suggestion for putting the ukaz into practice. Its president, S.Yu. Witte, was trying to broaden the role of the Committee as far as possible, making it a kind of 'headquarters' for the transformations. Witte included among his rights the formation of special extra-departmental conferences, the presidents of which, it is true, should have been appointed by the sovereign. In order to work out the recommendations for carrying out the sixth point in the ukaz, which spoke of the autocrat's unbending desire to maintain tolerance in matters of the faith, a Conference of Ministers and Presidents of the Departments of the State Council was organized. The task placed before this organ was to review 'the laws on the rights of the schismatics, as well as of persons belonging to heterodox and non-Christian confessions.'

"It was as if there had been no talk about the Orthodox Church. However, it was clear that the review of the rights of the Old Ritualists and representatives of non-Orthodox confessions would inevitably touch the interests of the first and ruling confession in the empire. It was normal that the question of the situation of the Orthodox Church should be raised as a result of the review of the general state apparatus: the 'symphony of powers' in its imperial variant signified the primacy of the secular power over the spiritual power. This was well understood by contemporaries. Thus Metropolitan Eulogius (Georgievsky), in remembering the past, noted that it was precisely 'the reform of the state apparatus that drew in its wake the project for the reform of the Church'. The metropolitan went on to point out that S.Yu. Witte's note became a significant event. He evidently had in mind the note that saw the light in February, 1905 and signed by the president of the Committee of Ministers. It was called 'On the Contemporary Situation of the Orthodox Church' and was composed for S.Yu. Witte by professors of the theological academies in the capital.

"The note said that while externally free and protected by the State, the Orthodox Church was weighed down by heavy chains. The expulsion of the principle of sobornost' from Church life had led to a change in her spirit. The main cause of the disorders was recognized to be Peter's Church reform, as a result of which the Church's administration had turned into one of the 'numerous wheels of the complex machine of State'. The secular bureaucratic element was called a constant barrier between the Church and the people, as also between the Church and the State, while the only way to excite life from the dead was to return to the former, canonical norms of administration.

"Witte also subjected the contemporary situation of the Orthodox parish to sharp criticism; 'only the name remained' from it. The reasons for the fall of the parish were attributed by the authors of the note to the development of State centralization and the intensification of serfdom in Russia in the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries; the imposition of police duties on the clergy, as a consequence of which it was separated from its flock; the caste alienation of the clergy, and the payments it demanded for the carrying out of needs. But the autonomous re-establishment of small ecclesiastical units, which is what the parishes were, would not attain its aim if a general reform of the Church administration were not carried out: the parishes had to be linked by spiritual communion and pour into the community of the diocese, while 'diocesan assemblies' having Local Councils as their model should be convened periodically in parallel with the parish meetings.

"Later the note touched on the problem of the alienation from the Church of a significant part of the intelligentsia. Only the Church herself could resolve this problem and overcome the 'spiritual schism'. The problem of the theological school was also raised; it was declared to be a task of the whole State, 'for the degree of the influence of religion on the people depends completely on its organization'. The union of Church and State was wholeheartedly approved, while the 'self-governing activity' of the ecclesiastical and state organism, in the opinion of the authors, had to achieve the equilibrium destroyed by Peter the Great. With this aim it was necessary to convene a Local Council in which both white clergy and laity would participate. 'In view of the present undeniable signs of a certain inner shaking both of society and of the masses of the people," pointed out Witte, 'it would be dangerous to wait. Religion constitutes the main foundation of the popular spirit, and through it the Russian land had stood and been strong up to now.'

"And so in S.Yu. Witte's not the question was posed not about particular changes, but about a general ecclesiastical reform, which would lead to a strengthening of the independence of the Orthodox Church and would sharply reduce the privileges of the over-procurator's authority. After all, it was a secret to nobody that in speaking about 'dry bureaucratic principles', the president of the Committee of Ministers had in mind the rules that found their completed expression in the activity of the department of the Orthodox confession.

"It was at about the same time, in February, that another note appeared expressing the opinion of the capital's Metropolitan Anthony: 'Questions relating to desirable transformations in the position of our Orthodox Church'. Vladyka reviewed concrete questions of the reform of the ecclesiastical administration that demanded a very speedy resolution. Referring to the discussions on religious toleration that had taken place in the Committee of Ministers, he noted: the authorities are opening to those who have separated from the Orthodox Church (the Old Ritualists, sectarians and others) 'a definite position in the State' without touching their inner church life, at the same time that the 'ruling' Church is deprived of such freedom. Citing the Popovtsi Old Ritualists who had accepted 'the Austrian hierarchs' as an example, Metropolitan Anthony warned: 'The danger may occur that this community will be turned into the people's Church while the Orthodox Church will remain only the State Church'.

"In pointing to the Church's position within the State, Vladyka placed before the authorities a question of principle: had not the moment come to weaken the control of the secular authorities over the life of the Church? Other questions followed logically from that: should not the Church be given a greater freedom in the administration of her internal affairs? Should Orthodox priests also have the right to be permanent members of social-state institutions having their place in the parishes? After this it was natural to pose the further question on the desirability of providing the Church hierarchy with the right to participate in the sessions of the State Council, the Committee of Ministers and other higher state institutions with the right to vote in them.

"The note undoubtedly touched on the privileges of the over-procurator of the Most Holy Synod. After all, if the desires expressed by the metropolitan were to be satisfied, the Orthodox episcopate would receive the possibility of independently, with the mediation of the State, influencing legislative proposals touching the Church, that is, it would have the right of a political voice in the empire. It is understandable that C.P. Pobedonostsev could not welcome such self-will, the more so in that, besides questions on the position of the Orthodox Church in Russia, the metropolitan gave reasons for the need to review the structure of the Church and some aspects of the Church's administration, and spoke about the particular importance of recognizing the parish as a legal person and on the desirability of reviewing the laws that regulated the right of the Church to own, acquire and use property… "[122]

Pobedonostsev suspected that Witte and Metropolitan Anthony were in league against him, and mounted a vigorous campaign to stop the projected reforms, defending the Petrine system. On March 13 he succeeded in persuading the emperor to remove the question of Church reforms from the competence of the Conferences of Ministers and Heads of State Departments and place it before the Holy Synod. However, this was only a seeming

[122] Firsov, op. cit., pp. 149-153.

victory: the Holy Synod was no less in favour of the reforms than was Witte and the State. On March 17 the Synod recognized the necessity of reviewing the present situation of the Church vis-á-vis the State "in view of the changed situation of the heterodox confessions, the so-called Old Ritualists and sectarians, and transform the Church's administration". The restoration of the patriarchate was deemed desirable "for the sake of the honour of the Russian State", and it was suggested that a Local Council be convened in Moscow composed of the diocesan bishops and their representatives. On March 18 the Synod resolved to present a report to the Tsar with an icon. On March 22 the seven members of the Synod signed an appeal to the Tsar to convene a Council "at the appropriate time" in Moscow, at which a patriarch would be elected and a series of major questions of Church life would be discussed.[123]

Once again, on March 31, Pobedonostsev succeeded in persuading the Tsar to put off the Synod's project and avoid giving Metropolitan Anthony an audience. The Tsar wrote on the Synod's appeal: "I admit the impossibility of accomplishing, in the anxious times we are living through, such a great work requiring both calm and careful thought as the convening of a Local Council. I reserve for myself, when the fitting time for this will come, in accordance with the ancient examples of the Orthodox Emperors, the task of giving this work momentum and convening a Council of the All-Russian Church for the canonical discussion of matters of faith and Church administration."

However, Pobedonostev's victory could only be temporary: society's interest in the reforms was increasing, and even V.M. Skvortsov in the conservative journal *Missionerskoe Obozrenie*, after pointing out that the martyred Great Prince Sergius Alexandrovich had been in favour of the reforms, expressed the opinion that "the reform of the administration of the dominant Church has appeared as *the logical end and natural consequence of the confessional* reform which was so quickly and decisively pushed through by S.Yu. Witte and a special Conference of the Committee of Ministers".[124]

On May 5, the Tsar consented to see the metropolitan, who explained that to delay the reform was neither possible nor desirable. "But as long as Pobedonostsev is alive, we cannot expect much." On May 18 the Tsar officially thanked the Synod for the icon and the report that had been composed two months before. In this way he indicated that Pobedonostsev's bid to keep the Petrine system untouched had failed. A few months later the venerable over-procurator went into retirement – a man who had done much for the Russian Church and State, but whose usefulness had passed…

[123] Firsov, op. cit., p. 163.
[124] Skvortsov, in Firsov, op. cit., p. 172.

14. THE APRIL DECREE AND THE OCTOBER MANIFESTO

The confessional reform referred to by Skvortsov reached its legal enactment in the Tsar's ukaz of April 17, the Sunday of Pascha, "On the Strengthening of the Principles of Religious Toleration".

St. John of Kronstadt, among others, was critical of the decree, seeing it as one product of the revolutionary unrest: "Look what is happening in this kingdom at the present time: everywhere students and workers are on strike; everywhere there is the noise of parties who have as their goal the overthrowing of the true monarchical order established by God, everywhere the dissemination of insolent, senseless proclamations, disrespect for the authority of the ruling powers established by God, for 'there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God': children and young people imagine that they are the master and commanders of their own fates; marriage has lost all meaning for many and divorces at will have multiplied to endlessness; many children are left to the whims of fate by unfaithful spouses; some kind of senselessness and arbitrariness rule… Finally, an unpunished conversion from Orthodoxy into any faith whatever is allowed [the Decree of April 17, 1905]; even though the same Lord we confess designated death in the Old Testament for those denying the law of Moses.

"If matters continue like this in Russia and the atheists and the anarchist-crazies are not subjected to the righteous retribution of the law, and if Russia is not cleansed of its many tares, then it will become desolate like the ancient kingdoms and cities wiped out by God's righteous judgement from the face of the earth for their godlessness and their wickedness: Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Greece-Macedonia.

"Hold fast, then, Russia, to your faith, and your Church, and to the Orthodox Tsar if you do not wish to be shaken by people of unbelief and lawlessness and if you do not wish to be deprived of your Kingdom and the Orthodox Tsar. But if you fall away from your faith, as many intelligenty have fallen away, then you will no longer be Russia or Holy Rus', but a rabble of all kinds of other faiths that wish to destroy one another."[125]

The final defeat of the Russian navy at Tsushima in May, 1905[126] increased the political tensions in Russia. A meeting in Moscow of representatives from the zemstvos, the nobility and the municipal councils called for the convocation of a national representative body elected on a secret, equal, universal and direct ballot. On June 6 a delegation from the meeting led by Prince Sergius Trubetskoj was received by the Tsar, and on August 6 what became known as the Bulygin Constitution was published: a proposal for a consultative parliamentary body called the Duma. Although the franchise to this parliament was limited, its powers limited, and "the inviolability of

[125] St. John of Kronstadt, in Kizenko, op. cit., pp. 247-248.

[126] An event apparently foretold by Rasputin, whose influence consequently began to grow…

autocratic power" was retained, it represented a major concession by the government to the liberal opposition.

But the liberals were not satisfied…

On August 27 the government made another unexpected concession: university faculties were allowed to elect rectors and students to hold assemblies. Moreover, the police were told to keep out of the universities, making them in effect "no-go" areas. Soon workers and other non-students joined the student meetings, and "academic work became impossible as institutions of higher learning turned into 'political clubs': non-conforming professors and students were subjected to intimidation and harassment… In Witte's view, the university regulations of August 27 were a disaster: 'It was the first breach through which the Revolution, which had ripened underground, emerged into the open.'"[127]

At the end of September a wave of strikes, economic in origin, but politicised by the Union of Unions and the radical students, hit Central Russia. They culminated in a vast general strike in mid-October. The country was descending into anarchy. Witte tried to persuade the Tsar to introduce a constitutional monarchy. He resisted for some time, but finally gave in… The Tsar gave in because the only real alternative, the imposition of a military dictatorship, was rejected by the man whom he called upon to take up the post: Grand Duke Nicholas Nikolayevich Romanov. The parallel with February, 1917 and the behaviour of the generals then is revealing…

Both Witte and D.F. Trepov, the Governor-General of St. Petersburg, were in favour of the creation of a constitutional monarchy on the lines of the Bulygin Constitution. "To the question whether he [Trepov] could restore order in the capital without risking a massacre, he answered that 'he could give no such guarantee either now or in the future: rebellion [kramola] has attained a level at which it was doubtful whether [bloodshed] could be avoided. All that remains is faith in the mercy of God.'

"Still unconvinced, Nicholas asked Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich to assume dictatorial powers. The Grand Duke is said to have responded that the forces for a military dictatorship were unavailable and that unless the Tsar signed the manifesto he would shoot himself…"[128]

In his Manifesto of October 17, 1905, which was entitled "On the Improvement of Order in the State", the Tsar declared: "The disturbances and unrest in St Petersburg, Moscow and in many other parts of our Empire have filled Our heart with great and profound sorrow. The welfare of the Russian Sovereign and His people is inseparable and national sorrow is His too. The present disturbances could give rise to national instability and present a

[127] Pipes, op. cit., pp. 36-37.
[128] Pipes, op. cit., p. 43.

threat to the unity of Our State. The oath which We took as Tsar compels Us to use all Our strength, intelligence and power to put a speedy end to this unrest which is so dangerous for the State. The relevant authorities have been ordered to take measures to deal with direct outbreaks of disorder and violence and to protect people who only want to go about their daily business in peace. However, in view of the need to speedily implement earlier measures to pacify the country, we have decided that the work of the government must be unified. We have therefore ordered the government to take the following measures in fulfilment of our unbending will:

1. Fundamental civil freedoms will be granted to the population, including real personal inviolability, freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and association.
2. Participation in the Duma will be granted to those classes of the population which are at present deprived of voting powers, insofar as is possible in the short period before the convocation of the Duma, and this will lead to the development of a universal franchise. There will be no delay to the Duma elect already been organized.
3. It is established as an unshakeable rule that no law can come into force without its approval by the State Duma and representatives of the people will be given the opportunity to take real part in the supervision of the legality of government bodies.

We call on all true sons of Russia to remember the homeland, to help put a stop to this unprecedented unrest and, together with this, to devote all their strength to the restoration of peace to their native land."[129]

The date of the Manifesto, October 17, was also the date of the creation of the St. Petersburg Soviet, or "the Soviet of Workers' Deputies" to give it its official name, which was controlled by the socialists (they had twenty-one out of fifty seats on the Executive Committee). And so the triumph of the liberal phase of the revolution coincided, by that inexorable logic that we find in all revolutions, with the beginning of its more radical, communist successor. If the Antichrist was born in February, 1917, he was conceived in October, 1905…

Witte was invited to chair the Council of Ministers, whom he, and not the Tsar, now selected. The position of the Prime Minister under the constitution was now critical – and critically ambiguous. Was he still primarily a servant of the Tsar? Or was he simply a servant of the Duma, and answerable before them for producing a government "responsible to the people"?

Fr. Lev Lebedev writes: "When some time had passed, Witte began to praise his Majesty with sweet words for 'the people's representation' in which the Tsar would find support. Nicholas II interrupted him: 'Sergius Yulyevich:

[129] *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossijskoi Imperii* (A Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire), 3rd series, vol. XXV/I, N 26803.

I very well understand that I am creating for myself *not a helper,* but *an enemy*, but I comfort myself with the thought that I will succeed in bringing up a state force which will turn out to be useful for providing Russia in the future with a path of peaceful development, without sharp undermining of those supports on which she has lived for so long.' In the new order the old State Council, composed of high-ranking dignitaries appointed by the Tsar was preserved, as a kind of 'higher chamber'. However, all this together with the Duma *was not a parliament*, since his Majesty was not intending to renounce his autocratic power. He made a public declaration about this during a reception of a monarchist organization: 'The reforms I announced on October 17 will be realized unfailingly, and the freedoms given by me in the same way to the whole of the population are inalienable. But my Autocracy will remained *what it was of old.*'…"[130]

But could the Autocracy remain what it was when there was now a Duma with not merely consultative, but also legislative powers? Was it not now in effect a constitutional monarchy?

Pipes writes: "Two aspects of the October Manifesto call for comment, for otherwise a great deal of the political history of the last decade of the Imperial regime will be incomprehensible.

"The manifesto was extracted from Nicholas under duress, virtually at the point of a gun. For this reason he never felt morally obligated to respect it.

"Second, it made no mention of the word 'constitution'. The omission was not an oversight. Although the claim has been made that Nicholas did not realize he had committed himself to a constitution, contemporary sources leave no doubt that he knew better. Thus, he wrote to his mother on October 19 that granting the Duma legislative authority meant 'in essence, constitution'. Even so, he wanted at all costs to avoid the detested word in order to preserve the illusion that he remained an autocrat. He had been assured by the proponents of liberal reforms that under a constitutional regime he would continue as the exclusive source of laws and that he could always revoke what he had granted. He believed this explanation because it helped assuage his conscience, which was troubled by the thought that he might have violated his coronation oath. This self-deception – the absurd concept of a constitutional autocrat – would cause no end of trouble in relations between the Crown and the Duma in the years to come."[131]

Although he has a point, Pipes overstates his case and is too harsh on the Tsar. For it remained a fact that if the Tsar was above the law, and the source of all (non-ecclesiastical) law, then if he bestowed a law, or even a constitution, he was entitled to change it or remove it altogether. Moreover,

[130] Lebedev, op. cit., pp. 424-425.
[131] Pipes, op. cit., p. 44.

his subjects were bound by their oath of allegiance to accept such a change, whatever they might think privately of the Tsar's inconsistency.

This argument was put forward, for example, by N. Rodzevich in *Moskovskie Vedomosti*: "Let us assume that the Tsar is not knowledgeable on military affairs. Well, he selects an experienced general and declares that without the agreement of this general no military question may be decided. A time comes and the Tsar realizes that the general selected by him gives bad advice; can he really not change his previous order and dismiss the general? Of course he may do so. Similarly, if the Duma does not warrant the Tsar's confidence, would he not be justified in dissolving the Duma and then creating a new one or refusing to convoke one at all? This depends on the Autocrat's will."[132]

The Manifesto not only failed to pacify the country: the anarchy increased as young Jewish and Russian revolutionaries rampaged in the cities, the press, freed from all restraints, raged against the government, and the police, overstretched and unsure of their rights under the new constitutional regime, hesitated to apply strong measures. Even the peasants began to be violent…

"The peasantry completely misunderstood the October Manifesto, interpreting it in its own manner as giving the communes licence to take over the countryside. Some rural disorders occurred in the spring of 1905, more in the summer, but they exploded only after October 17. Hearing of strikes and pogroms [both anti-Christian and anti-Jewish] in the cities going unpunished, the peasants drew their own conclusions. Beginning on October 23, when large-scale disorders broke out in Chernigov province, the wave of rural disorders kept on swelling until the onset of winters, re-emerging in the spring of 1906 on an even vaster scale. It would fully subside only in 1908 following the adoption of savage repressive measures by Prime Minister Stolypin.

"… The principal aim of the jacquerie was neither inflicting physical harm nor even appropriating land, but depriving landlords and other non-peasant landowners of the opportunity to earn a livelihood in the countryside – 'smoking them out', as the saying went. In the words of one observer: 'The [peasant] movement was directed almost exclusively against landed properties and not against the landlord: the peasants had no use whatever for landlords but they did need the land.' The notion was simple: force the landlords to abandon the countryside and to sell their land at bargain prices. To this end, the peasants cut down the landlord's forests, sent cattle to graze on his pasture, smashed his machinery, and refused to pay rent. In some places, manors were set on fire…

[132] Rodzevich, in Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905,* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992, p. 12.

"In an effort to stem the agrarian unrest, the government in early November reduced the due instalments of the redemption payments (payments for the land given the emancipated serfs in 1861) and promised to abolish them altogether in January 1907, but these measures did little to calm the rural districts.

"In 1905 and 1906 peasants by and large refrained from seizing the land they coveted from fear that they would not be allowed to keep it. They still expected a grand national repartition of all the non-communal land, but whereas previously they had looked to the Tsar to order it, they now pinned their hopes on the Duma. The quicker they drove the landlords out, they reasoned, the sooner the repartition would take place…

"The government faced one more trial of strength, this time with the radical left. In this conflict, there was no room for compromises, for the socialists would be satisfied with nothing less than a political and social revolution.

"The authorities tolerated the St. Petersburg Soviet, which continued to sit in session although it no longer had a clear purpose. On November 26, they order the arrest of Nosar, its chairman. A three-man Presidium (one of whose members was Leon Trotsky) which replaced Nosar resolved to respond with an armed uprising. The first act, which it was hoped would bring about a financial collapse, was an appeal to the people (the so-called Financial Manifesto), issued on December 2, urging them to withhold payments to the Treasury, to withdraw money from savings accounts, and to accept only bullion or foreign currency. The next day, [the Interior Minister] Durnovo arrested the Soviet, putting some 260 deputies (about one-half of its membership) behind bars. Following these arrests a surrogate Soviet assembled under the chairmanship of Alexander Helphand (Parvus), the theoretician of 'permanent revolution'. On December 6, the St. Petersburg Soviet issued a call for a general strike to being two days later. The call went unheeded, even though the Union of Unions gave it its blessing.

"The socialists were more successful in Moscow. The Moscow Soviet, formed only on November 21 by intellectuals of the three principal socialist parties, decided to press the revolution beyond its 'bourgeois' phase. Their followers consisted of semi-skilled workers, many of them employed in the textile industry, professionally and culturally less mature than their counterparts in the capital. The principal force behind this effort was the Moscow Bolshevik Committee. The Moscow rising was the first occasion in the 1905 Revolution when the socialists took the lead. On December 6, the Moscow Soviet voted to begin the following day an armed insurrection for the purpose of overthrowing the tsarist government, convoking a Constituent Assembly, and proclaiming a democratic republic.

"On December 7, Moscow was paralyzed: the strike was enforced by Soviet agents who threatened with violence anyone who refused to cooperate.

Two days later, government forces launched an attack on the insurgents; the latter responded with urban guerilla tactics. The arrival of the Semeonovskii Regiment, which used artillery to disperse the rioters, settled the issue. On December 18 the Executive Committee of the Moscow Soviet capitulated. Over 1,000 people lost their lives in the uprising and whole areas of the ancient capital were gutted…"[133]

An important role in turning the tide against the revolutionaries was played by Metropolitan Vladimir of Moscow. Already at his ordination, he had said: "A priest who is not a monarchist is unworthy to stand at the Holy Altar. A priest who is republican is always of little faith. A monarch is consecrated to his power by God, a president receives power from the pride of the people; a monarch is powerful through his carrying out of the commandments of God, a president holds on to power by pleasing the mob; a monarch leads his faithful subjects to God, a president leads them away from God."[134] Now he said: "The heart bleeds when you see what is happening around us… It is no longer the Poles, or external enemies, but our own Russian people, who, having lost the fear of God, have trusted the rebels and are holding our first capital as it were in a siege. Even without this we have been having a hard time because of our sins: first harvest failures [in 1891, 1897, 1898 and 1901], then illnesses, then an unsuccessful war [the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05], and now something unheard of is taking place in Rus': it is as if God has deprived Russian people of their minds. By order of underground revolutionaries, strikes have begun everywhere, in the factories, in the schools, on the railways… Oh if only our unfortunate workers knew who is ruling them, who is sending them trouble-maker-agitators, then they would have turned from them in horror as from poisonous snakes! You know these are the so-called social-democrats, these are the revolutionaries, who have long ago renounced God in their works. They have renounced Him, and yet it may be that they have never known the Christian faith. They denounce her servants, her rites, they mock her holy things. Their main nest is abroad: they are dreaming of subduing the whole world to themselves; in their secret protocols they call us, the Christians, animals, to whom God, they say, have given a human face only in order that it should not be repulsive to them, His chosen ones, to use our services… With satanic cunning they catch light-minded people in their nets, promising them paradise on earth, but they carefully hide from them their secret aims, their criminal dreams. Having deceived the unfortunate, they drag him to the most terrible crimes, as if for the sake of the common good, and, in fact they make him into an obedient slave. They try in every way to cast out of his soul, or at any rate to distort, the teaching of Christ. Thus the commandments of Christ say: do not steal, do not covet what belongs to another, but they say: everything is common, take from the rich man everything you like. The commandments of Christ say: share your last morsel, your last kopeck with your neighbour, but they teach:

---

[133] Pipes, op. cit., pp. 48-50.

[134] In Valentina Sologub, *Kto Gospoden – Ko Mne!* (He who is the Lord's – Come to me!), Moscow, 2007, p. 45.

take from others everything that you need. The commandments of Christ say: give to Caesar what is Caesar's, fear God, venerate the Tsar, but they say: we don't need any Tsar, the Tsar is a tyrant… The commandments of God say: in patience possess your souls, but they say: in struggle acquire your rights. The commandment of Christ orders us to lay down our souls for our friends, but they teach to destroy people who are completely innocent, to kill them only for the fact they do not agree with them, and do not embark on robbery, but just want to work honourably and are ready to stand for the law, for the Tsar, for the Church of God…"

"The sermon of Metropolitan Vladimir elicited the annoyance of the liberal-democratic press, and also of the liberal clergy. The latter either read the sermon in a shortened version, or did not read it at all. In the leftist newspaper *Russkoe Slovo* 76 priests published a declaration regarding their 'complete non-solidarity' with 'the "Word" of Metropolitan Vladimir…'

"As a result of the actions of the priests quarrels also arose amidst their flock. The Synod, in response to this, unfortunately saw in the epistle of Metropolitan Vladimir, not a call to defend the Faith and the Fatherland, but 'a call to the local population to defend themselves in the sphere of political convictions', and in their 'Resolution of October 22, 1905 □ 150' instructed the diocesan bishops and the clergy subject to them to make efforts 'to remove quarrels in the population', which, to a large extent, were continuing because of the opposition of the liberal priests to their metropolitan.

"But nothing could devalue or undermine the influence of the epistle of Metropolitan Vladimir on the Muscovites, and the true Russian people responded to it. The day after the publication of the 'Word', the workers began to serve molebens and return to work; the city water-supply began to work, the trams began to run, etc. Metropolitan Vladimir himself went to the factories and, after prayer, conducted archpastoral discussions with the workers.

"Later, in evaluating the labours of the holy hierarch Vladimir in overcoming the disturbances of 1905, Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) said the following notable words about him: 'Meek and humble, never seeking anything for himself, honourable and a lover of righteousness, Vladyka Vladimir gradually and quietly ascended the hierarchical ladder and was immediately exalted by his authority, drawing the hearts of ecclesiastical and patriotic Russia to himself during the days of general instability and treachery, when there were few who remained faithful to their duty and their oath, firm in the defence of the Orthodox Church, the Tsar-Autocrat and the Homeland… when everything began to shake in our Rus', and many pillars began to waver…' (speech of Archbishop Anthony of Zhitomir and Volhynia at the triumphal dinner given by Metropolitan Vladimir in honour of Patriarch Gregory of Antioch who was visiting Russia, 22 February, 1913).

"By 'pillars' Vladyka Anthony probably had in mind the liberal members of the Most Holy Synod, who did not support their brother, Metropolitan Vladimir…"[135]

One of these was undoubtedly Archbishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) of Finland, the future first Soviet patriarch. Thus "when in 1905 the revolutionary professors began to demand reforms in the spiritual schools, then, in the words of Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), 'his Grace Sergius… wavered in faith.'"[136]

Again, when the revolutionary Peter Schmidt was shot in 1906, Archbishop Sergius, who was at that time rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, served a pannikhida at his grave. He also gave refuge in his hierarchical house in Vyborg to the revolutionaries Michael Novorussky and Nicholas Morozov (a participant in the attempt on the life of Tsar Alexander II). Having such sympathies, it is not surprising that he was not liked by the Royal Family.[137]

---

[135] Riasophor-Monk Anempodist, "Sviaschennomuchenik mitropolit Vladimir (Bogoiavlenskij) i bor'ba s revoliutsii" (Hieromartyr Metropolitan Vladimir (Bogoiavlensky) and the struggle against the revolution), *Pravoslavnaia Zhizn' (Orthodox Life)*, 53, N 1 (636), January, 2003, pp. 2-10.

[136] "Preemstvennost' Grekha" (The Heritage of Sin), publication of the parish of the Holy New Martyrs and Confessors of Russia, Tsaritsyn, p. 7.

[137] In 1915 the Empress wrote to the Emperor that Sergius "must leave the Synod" (A. Paryaev, "Mitropolit Sergij Stragorodskij: Neizvestnaia Biographia" (Metropolitan Sergius Stragorodsky: The Unknown Biography), *Suzdal'skie Eparkhial'nie Vedomosti* (Suzdal Diocesan News), N 1, September, 1997, pp. 12-15.

15. THE CHURCH AND THE JEWS

The disorders in the southern cities which have been called Jewish pogroms began immediately after the proclamation of the Manifesto. The general pattern of the disorders was as follows. First the revolutionaries, usually led by young Jews, would call on the population to strike and free prisoners from the prisons, and would themselves tear down the symbols of tsarist authority, although "undoubtedly both Russians and Jews took part in the destruction of portraits and monograms".[138] Then, a day or two later, when it was clear that the authorities were unwilling or unable to restore order, the anti-Jewish pogrom would begin.

The wrath of the people was directed not only against the Jews but against leftists generally. Thus in Tver a crowd set fire to the theatre in which the leftists were sitting – two hundred perished. Another crowd threatened to do the same thing in Balashov, but thanks to the courageous actions of the governor, Peter Arkadyevich Stolypin, there were no victims.

And yet, considering the scale of the disturbances, there were far fewer victims than might have been expected – one thousand dead and several thousand wounded, according to one Jewish source. Again, the Jew G. Sliozberg, a contemporary witness who was in possession of all the information, wrote: "Fortunately, all these hundreds of pogroms did not bring in their wake significant violence against the persons of Jews, and in the vast majority of places the pogroms were not accompanied by murders."[139] For in 1905 faith and morality still held the great majority of the Orthodox people back from taking revenge against their persecutors. It would be a different story during the Civil War…

On October 27 the Tsar wrote to his mother "that the pogromshchiki represented 'a whole mass of loyal people', reacting angrily to 'the impertinence of the Socialists and revolutionaries… and, because nine-tenths of the trouble-makers are Jews, the People's whole anger turned against them.' This analysis was accepted by many foreign observers, notably British diplomats like the ambassador at St. Petersburg, Sir Charles Hardinge, his councillor, Cecil Spring Rice, and the Consul-General in Moscow, Alexander Murray."[140] This analysis is also supported by Senator Kuzminsky, who concluded that "the October disturbances and disorders [in Odessa] were caused by factors of an undeniably revolutionary character and were crowned by a pogrom of Jews exclusively as a result of the fact that it was the representatives of this nationality who took the dominant part in the revolutionary movement".[141]

---

[138] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti let vmeste* (Two Hundred Years Together) (1795-1995), part 1, Moscow: "Russkij Put'", 2001, p. 375.
[139] Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 401.
[140] Niall Ferguson, *The War of the World,* London: Penguin Books, 2006, p. 68.
[141] Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 398-399.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has shown by extensive quotations from Jewish sources that the Jews were well aware of the true state of affairs. Even the more honest Jews had to admit that 1905 was in essence "a Jewish revolution". "Thus in November, 1905 a certain Jacob de Haas in an article entitled 'The Jewish Revolution' in the London Zionist journal *Maccabee* wrote directly: 'The revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution, for it is the turning point in Jewish history. This situation stems from the fact that *Russia is the fatherland of about half of the overall number of Jews inhabiting the world…*'"[142]

Many representatives of the Church played an important and laudable role in the disturbances, protecting the Jews against the wrath of the people. Thus in Kiev Metropolitan Flavian tried to restrain the patriotic crowds. And Protopriest Michael Yedlinsky, the future catacomb hieromartyr, in full vestments, together with his clerics, choir and banners, headed a procession in the direction of the Kontactovi Square and Gostini Place, where some Jewish shops were located. The procession moved along the boulevard, cutting off the rioters from Gostini Place. People in the crowd removed their hats out of respect. When Batyushka turned to the rioters admonishing them, many of them calmed down and began to disperse, even more so because a squadron of cavalrymen began to move onto the square from Alexander Street.[143]

Another hero was Archbishop Plato, the future Metropolitan of North America. Charles Johnston writes: "On October 22, 1905… a huge throng of wildly excited townsmen assembled, inflamed by stories and rumors of misdoings, determined to raid the Jewish quarter [of Kiev]. Their pretext was that a Jew had cursed the Emperor and spat upon his portrait.

"When the multitude assembled Archbishop Platon was in his own church in full canonicals, with his miter upon his head. He heard the angry storming of the crowd without and realized its meaning and purpose. Instantly he came to a decision, and in robes and miter went forth to meet the multitude. Of the church attendants only two accompanied him. So the tumultuous throng came on, crying for vengeance upon the Jews, and Archbishop Platon went to meet them. It had rained heavily all night and was raining still. Paying no heed to the pools of water and mud that covered the street, the Archbishop, seeing that there was but one way to check the hysterically excited mob, knelt down in the street immediately in the pathway of the turbulently advancing throng and began to pray.

"The profound love and veneration for the Church which is at the center of every Russian heart was touched, and the multitude wavered, halted, grew suddenly silent. Those who were in front checked those who were behind, and a whisper ran through the crowd carrying word that the Archbishop was kneeling in the street praying, in spite of the mud and rain.

---

[142] Lebedev, op. cit., p. 421.

[143] "New Martyr Archpriest Michael Edlinsky", *Orthodox Life*, vol. 39, N 2, March-April, 1989.

"After he had prayed Archbishop Platon rose and confronted the huge throng.

"He spoke, and his fiery words so dominated the multitude that he led the turbulent thousands to the church and made them promise, calling God to witness, that they would leave the Jews unharmed and return quietly to their homes. Thus the multitude was checked and the work of destruction was prevented by the great churchman's fearless devotion.

"The impression which this exhibition of devoted valor made on the public of Kieff was immediate and profound. The Jews especially were full of gratitude…"[144]

In spite of the courage displayed by these churchmen in defending the Jews, many liberals accused the Church of "anti-semitism" on the grounds of her principled rejection of the religion of the Talmud and the membership of many churchmen in the monarchist popular movement called "the Black Hundreds". This movement has been the subject of much vilification in Soviet and Western sources as the mainstay of "anti-semitism" in the Russian people. In fact, it played little part in the revolution of 1905, becoming more important in 1906-07, and was not so much anti-semitic as anti-Talmudist, anti-revolutionary and pro-monarchical.

Famous churchmen who supported the Union included Metropolitan Vladimir of Moscow, Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Volhynia, St. John of Kronstadt, the future Hieromartyr John Vostorgov and the future confessor of the Catacomb Church Elder Theodosius of Minvody. However, not all the Church establishment supported it. In particular, Metropolitan Anthony (Vadkovsky) of St. Petersburg was opposed, and was suspected by many of being a closet liberal.[145]

Both Archbishop Anthony and St. John of Kronstadt rejected the accusation of anti-semitism and condemned the pogroms. Thus Archbishop Anthony wrote: "… It is unpleasant to talk about oneself, but if you ask anyone who is close to me or knows me well: what is he most interested in? they would tell you: monasticism, communion with the Eastern Churches, the struggle with Latinism, the transformation of the theological schools, the creation of a new direction of Orthodox theology [in opposition to scholasticism], the Yedinoverie [Old Ritualists in union with the Orthodox Church], the typicon of Divine services, Slavophilism, Orthodoxy in Galicia… etc. But no one would name Judophobia as one of my most important interests…

---

[144] Johnston, "Archbishop Platon Discourses", *Harper's Weekly,* July 27, 1912, p. 10; quoted by Andrew Komendarov, in "[paradosis] Re: More Anti-semitism couched as 'True Orthodoxy'", orthodox-tradition@yahoogroups.com, February 8, 2006.

[145] See Danilushkin, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 78-80, 771-783; Kizenko, op. cit., chapter 7.

"… Concerning the Jews I delivered and published a sermon in 1903 (against pogroms), thanks to which the pogroms that enveloped the whole of the south-western region did not take place in Volhynia in that year. In 1905 in the sixth week of the Great Fast the Jews in Zhitomir shot at portraits of his Majesty and were beaten for that by the inhabitants of the suburb. The day before Palm Sunday I arrived from Petersburg and in Holy Week again delivered a speech against the pogrom that was being prepared for the first day of Pascha. This pogrom did not take place, and only after the murder by a Jewish hireling of the popular police-officer Kuyarov on the evening of Thomas Sunday, when I was leaving Zhitomir for Petersburg, did fights begin with the Jews, who later said that 'the government deliberately summoned our hierarch to Petersburg because while he was in the city they did not beat us'. In 1907 I published in a newspaper, and then a brochure with the article: 'The Jewish question and the Holy Bible', which has now been reissued in Yiddish. All this, however, did not stop the liberals from printing about me that I was going in cross processions to incite pogroms. Meanwhile, all pogroms have ceased in Volhynia since the Pochaev Union of the Russian People was formed in 1906…

"… If they are talking about the limitation of rights [of the Jews], not for the highest motives of defending the poor Little Russians from Jewish exploiters, but out of hatred for the latter, then this is truly disgusting, but if the patriots do not hate the Jews, but love and pity them, but do not want to give horns to a cow that butts, then this is reasonable, just and humane…"[146]

Archbishop Anthony laid the blame for the pogroms not only on the Jews, but more widely on the liberal-atheist spiritual climate that had been building up in Russia over generations, and which affected all nationalities. Already in 1899 he had rebuked the liberal, "unchurched" part of the Russian population as follows: "It is no longer a people, but a rotting corpse, which takes its rotting as a sign of life, while on it, or in it, live only moles, worms and foul insects… for in a living body they would find no satisfaction for their greed, and there would be nothing for them to live on".[147]

One of the problems of the Black Hundredist movement was its poor leadership, which gave it a bad name and doomed it to ineffectiveness. Thus "The Union of the Russian People" was led by A. Dubronin, who was only superficially Orthodox. When interviewed by the Cheka, Dubronin called himself a "communist monarchist", and declared: "By conviction I am a

---

[146] *Pis'ma Blazhenneishago Mitropolita Antonia (Khrapovitskago)* (The Letters of his Beatitude Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky)), Jordanville, 1988, pp. 37, 39.

[147] Quoted in N. Talberg, *Istoria Russkoj Tserkvi (History of the Russian Church)*, Jordanville, 1959, p. 831. Nor was he silent about other instigators of violence behind the scenes, such as the Old Ritualists. As he wrote in his 1912 encyclical to the Old Ritualists: "The spirit of this world… winks at real revolutionaries and sent the money of your rich men to create the Moscow rebellion of 1905." (in "Otnoshenia s Staroobriadchestvom (Relations with Old Ritualism)", *Vozdvizhenie, (Exaltation*), Winter, 2000, p. 76).

communist monarchist, that is, [I want] there to be monarchist government under which those forms of government [will flourish] which could bring the people an increase in prosperity. For me all kinds of cooperatives, associations, etc. are sacred." He was for the tsar, but against hierarchy. And he wanted to rid the empire of "the Germans", that is, that highly efficient top layer of the administration which proved itself as loyal to the empire as any other section of the population. The future Protomartyr John Vostorgov, one of the founders of the Union, considered Dubronin an enemy of the truth…

Another problem for the monarchists was the paradoxicality of the idea of a monarchical party in a monarchical State. A major advantage of a monarchical system is its avoidance of the divisiveness of party politics; the tsar stands above the various interests and lobbies and classes and reconciles them in obedience to his own person. But the October manifesto appeared to divide ultimate power between the Tsar and the Duma. And this made party politics inevitable. For there could never be a real unity between those who ascribed ultimate power to the Tsar and those who ascribed it to the Duma.

Moreover, the struggle between the "reds" and the "blacks" was not simply a struggle between different interpretations of the October manifesto, or between monarchists and constitutionalists, but between two fundamentally incompatible world-views - the Orthodox Christian and the Masonic-Liberal-Ecumenist. It was a struggle between two fundamentally opposed views of where true authority comes from – God, or the people. As such it was a struggle for the very heart of Russia.

16. THE PRE-CONCILIAR CONVENTION

In 1889 Vladimir Soloviev had written that "the Eastern Church had renounced its own power" in order to put it into the hands of the State. "He especially accused the Orthodox Church herself of having become a 'national Church' and of having thereby lost the right to represent Christ, to Whom had been confided all power in heaven and on earth. 'In every country reduced to a national Church,' he wrote, 'the secular government (be it autocratic or constitutional) enjoys the absolute plenitude of all authority, and the ecclesiastical institution figures only as a special minister dependent on the general administration of the State.'"[148]

This statement was an exaggeration. Nevertheless, there was enough truth in it to elicit a movement for "the liberation of the Church from the State" among the Church's intelligentsia. Paradoxically, it was Tsar Nicholas himself, who, in 1901, started the process by removing the phrase about recognising the tsar as "the supreme judge" from the oath that all hierarchs had to swear at their consecration. We have seen how this process then progressed, from the religio-philosophical meetings of 1901 to the decree of toleration in 1905. However, while the aim was laudable, and indeed of primary importance, the management of the process presented many problems; and in March, 1905 the Tsar postponed the convening of a Council to reform the administration of the Church and Church-State relations.

However, as the political situation began to stabilize, "already at the end of the same year," as E.E. Alferev writes, "on December 27, he addressed a rescript to Metropolitan Anthony of St. Petersburg in which he wrote: 'I now recognize that the time is quite right to carry out certain transformations in the structure of our native Church… I suggest that you determine the time for the convening of this Council.'

"On the basis of this rescript a Pre-Conciliar Convention was formed for the preparation of the convening of a Council, which soon set about its work. The convention carried out exceptionally important and valuable work demanding much time and labour, but the world war that broke out hindered the convening of the Council during the reign of Emperor Nicholas II. Instead of the peaceful situation which the Sovereign considered necessary for the introduction of such important reforms, it was convened in very unfavourable circumstances, during a terrible war, after the overthrow of the historical state structure of Russia, when the country was seized by revolutionary madness, and its most important decisions were taken to the sound of cannons during the beginning of the civil war."[149]

---

[148] Soloviev, *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle* (Russia and the Universal Church), Paris, 1937, p. 25.

[149] Alferev, *Imperator Nikolaj II kak Chelovek Sil'noj Voli* (Emperor Nicholas II as a Man of Strong Will), Jordanville: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1983, pp. 92-92.

The Pre-Conciliar Convention gathered detailed responses from the bishops and leading theologians on the main issues which were to dominate the history of the Orthodox Church in the coming century. The debates during the Convention brought to the fore several of those churchmen who would play such important roles, both for good and for ill, in the coming struggle with the revolution: on the one side, men such as Metropolitan Vladimir (Bogoyavlensky), Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky), Archbishop Theophan (Bystrov) of Poltava, Archbishop Tikhon (Bellavin) and Bishop Arsenius (Stadnitsky) of Pskov, and on the other, Bishop Antoninus (Granovsky), Archbishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) and Bishop Eulogius (Georgievsky). Thus among the suggestions made to the Convention we find the following one from Archbishop Sergius on January 18, which clearly looks forward to the renovationist movement of the 1920s:

- On the reform of the liturgical language: the future Council must debate the question of the simplification of the language of the Church, Slavonic, and the right accorded to the parish that wants it to serve the Divine offices in that language.
- It must think of abbreviating and simplifying the Typicon, and suppressing certain ritual actions, such as the breathing and spitting during the sacrament of baptism.
- It must think of abolishing the multiple repetitions of the same litanies during the same service, and replacing them by reading aloud the secret prayers during the Liturgy.
- It must think of giving priests [who have been widowed before the age of 45] the right to remarry."[150]

The first section of the Convention studied the questions of the composition of the future Council and the transformation of the central administration of the Church. The second section studied the question of the division of Russia into metropolitan districts and the transformation of the local Church administration. In June, the question of Georgian autocephaly also began to be discussed by this section. The third section studied Church courts and reviewed the laws of marriage, divorce and mixed marriages. The fourth section studied the questions of the parish, church schools, church property, diocesan congresses and the participation of clergy in public institutions. The fifth section studied the question of the transformation of spiritual-academic institutions. The sixth section studied the questions of the yedinoverie, the Old Ritualists and some other issues. The seventh section analyzed measures necessary "for the protection of the Orthodox Faith and Christian piety from wrong teachings and interpretations in view of the strengthening of the principles of religious toleration in the empire".[151]

---

[150] *Suggestions of the Diocesan Hierarchs on the Reform of the Church*, St. Petersburg, 1906, vol. 3, p. 443.
[151] Firsov, op. cit., pp. 222-223.

In May, 1906 a general assembly of the Convention decided that the future Council should be composed of clergy and laity, with a bishop, a priest and a layman being elected from each diocese. But while the clergy and laity were given the right to discuss all questions discussed in Council, the right to compose and confirm conciliar decisions was reserved for the bishops alone. This became the basis of the composition of the Council in 1917-18. However, few other recommendations of the sections were put into practice, and the Convention itself came to an end in December amidst a general waning of interest in it. In fact, according to F.D. Samarin, the results of the colossal amount of work put into the Convention amounted to nothing. There followed a decade in which the wounds of the Church continued to fester, and the authority of both Church and State continued to decline. In the end the much needed Local Council was convened, in accordance with Divine Providence, only when the Tsar himself had been swept away…

17. TURMOIL IN THE WESTERN BORDERLANDS

One reason for the ineffectiveness of the Pre-Conciliar Convention was that many of the problems that the Church faced could not be solved by decisions of the Church alone, but only – in the present state of Church-State relations – by the State. A particularly burning issue in this respect was the resurgence of the activity of heretics in various regions, but particularly in the western borderlands, in the wake of the April Decree on religious toleration. Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Volhynia addressed this problem in his report to the Convention entitled "On Freedom of Confession":

"Freedom of confession (not 'freedom of conscience': that is a senseless expression)," he said, "must of course be preserved in the State: there is no point in keeping anybody by force in the ruling Church; it is also necessary to excommunicate from the Church those who declare themselves to be outside her confession after exhorting them twice. But this is quite another matter than freedom of religious *propaganda*…

"Orthodoxy has very little to fear from the preaching of foreign religious dogmas, and hardly any religion would decide to address Orthodox listeners with such preaching; this would mean hoping to draw people from the light of the sun to a dim kerosene lamp. The propaganda of heterodoxy is possible only through cunning, deception and violence. Who does not know by what means the Latins drew to themselves 200,000 Orthodox Christians last year? They persistently spread the rumour that the Royal Family and even St. John of Kronstadt was joining their heresy, assuring the people that supposedly all Catholics would be re-ascribed to the Polish gentry and be given lands, while the Orthodox would be returned to the status of serfs. But that was still only half the sorrow. Representing in themselves almost the whole of the landowning class in the western and south-western region, the Polish gentry and counts are oppressing the Orthodox in their factories… The peasants there are completely in the hands of these contemporary feudal lords, and when they meet them they kiss their feet.

"And so even now, when there is not yet equality of religious confessions, they are bestowing on the renegades from Orthodoxy both money and forests and lands, while the faithful sons of the Church are being insulted, deprived of employment and expelled together with their earnings from the factories. What will the situation be when there is equality of confessions?

"The Protestants are acting by the same means in the north-western region, as are various sects in the Crimea and New Russia. Orthodoxy and the Orthodox, by contrast, despise such ways of acting. The Muslim or Jew, on accepting holy baptism, is often immediately lynched, that is, killed by his former co-religionists… Can the government leave them defenceless? Thousands of Christians have fallen into Mohammedanism in the last year; even several purely Russian families in Orenburg diocese have done so, having been subjected to threats, bribes and absurd rumours about the

imminent re-establishment of the Kirghiz kingdom with its hereditary dynasty, together with expulsion and even the beating up of all Christians.

"If the governments of all cultured countries punish falsification in trade, as well as the spreading of sensational false rumours and deliberate slander, etc., then our government, too, if it is to remain consistent, must protect the Orthodox people from the deceit, blackmail and economic and physical violence of the heterodox. They are able to act only by these means, as did the Catholics during the time of the Polish kingdom, when they seduced the Orthodox into the unia.

"Let us remember one more important circumstance that is completely ignored when talking about religious toleration.

"If our flock were catechized both in the truths of the faith and in how they should look on various faiths, peoples and estates, it would be possible to present them to themselves and to the spiritual influence of their pastors in the struggle for faith and nationality.

"But our government – more precisely, our State – has been attracted since the time of Peter and after by the aims of purely cultural and state centralization, constricting, distorting and even half eclipsing the religious consciousness and religious life of the Orthodox people. In the 17th century the latter had nothing to fear from any propaganda (except that of the Old Ritualists, of course), because, if not each peasant family, at any rate every village had its own teachers of dogmas, who lived the same peasant life as all the other village dwellers. Moreover, discipline in Church and everyday life was as strong as among the Jewish hassidim or, to take a closer example, our contemporary edinovertsy, to whom also, thanks to their conditions of life, no propaganda presented any danger.

"But the government of the 18th century tore away the clergy from the people, driving the former into the ranks of a separate caste, and educating it, not in the concepts and everyday discipline of popular Orthodoxy, but in the traditions of the Latin school and scholastic theological theory. The people was further and further estranged from Church literature and Church services, and which is still more sad, remained alone in its religious way of life, in its fasts, its prayers, its pilgrimages. The clergy became more and more learned and cultured, while the people became more and more ignorant and less steeped in Orthodox discipline. That is what happened with the Great Russian people, which was Orthodox from ages past. But what are we to say about the down-trodden, enslaved Western Little Russians and Belorussians, or about the descendants of the formerly baptized non-Russian peoples beyond the Volga and in Siberia?

"All these people, abandoned as regards spiritual development, chained to the land, had, willingly or unwillingly, to be reconciled to the thought that the Tsar, the lords, the bishops and the priests were reading sacred books and

studying the holy faith for them, while they themselves would listen to them – learned people who could find the leisure and the means to read.

"The grey village hardly distinguishes between spiritual bosses and secular ones, spiritual books and science from secular ones. Everything that comes from the legislative authorities comes from God; everything that is published in the newspapers comes from the Tsar and the bishops. Look at what views on life our poor people has come up against: the mountains of proclamations, the blasphemous brochures, the caricatures of August Personages and Fr. John of Kronstadt and all the rest with which yester-year's enlighteners have blessed their homeland.

"This is the clue how the people can believe the Catholic proclamations about his Majesty accepting this religion, and the revolutionary proclamations to the effect that the Tsar has supposedly ordered the landowners to be robbed, etc. And so, having taken into its hand the people's conscience, can the Russian government renounce Orthodoxy before the people has been catechized in it consciously? If it would like to take an extra-confessional stance, then let it first return to the people the confessional conscience it leased from it, let it give out millions over several years for the establishment of catechists – at least one for every 300 people (now there is one priest for every 2000 Orthodox Christians). But until then it is obliged to protect the Orthodox people from violent deception, from economic compulsion to apostasy.

"We said that an elective authority will not dare to violate the people's will, but it must get to know it and obey it. Government authority has, of course, lofty privileges, but it too is obliged to go in agreement, if not with everything that is contemporary, but in any case with the historically unchanged will of the people. It is in it that Russia, as a growing collective organism, as a nation, as an idea pouring out in history, is recognized. And what is this people in its history and its present? Is it an ethnographical group or a group, first of all, of self-defence at the level of the state? No, the Russians define themselves as a *religious* group, as a confessional group, including in this concept both the Georgians and the Greeks who cannot even speak Russian. According to the completely just definition of K. Aksakov and other Slavophiles, the Russian people thinks of itself as the flock of God, the Church, a society of people that accomplished their salvation with the guidance of its faith and through *prayer and labour*. The people looks on its life as a cross given it by God, and the whole of its earthly state prosperity it has entrusted to the Tsar. Let the Tsar with his boyars and warriors repel the enemies of his Orthodox country, let him take taxes and recruits for this end, let the Tsar judge his servants and punish thieves, robbers and other evil-doers; all this is of little interest to the Russian man, his work is to struggle in labour and prayer, and to learn virtue from the people of God. And let the Tsar and his warriors take care that nobody hinders him in this.

"True, in this country there are many people who are foreign to the aim of life that is embraced by the whole people, that is, salvation. But they do not hinder Russian people in this, let them without hindrance live in accordance with their 'pagan habits' and pray to their gods, until they recognize the true faith. But, of course, not only the personal life of each man, but also the mission of the whole Orthodox country is seen by each Russian as consisting in exalting the light of Orthodoxy both among his own 'heathen', and beyond the frontiers of his native land, as is proved for us by the constant missionary colonization by Russians of the East and the North, beginning from the 9th century, and their constant consciousness of their historical duty to liberate their co-religionists from under the Turk and bring down his 'God-hated kingdom', for which a litany is raised at the New Year moleben since the days of Ivan III to the days of Nicholas II.

"To renounce this task, which the people has considered for nine centuries to be its most important work, and to establish equality of rights for all faiths in the Russian state – this means to annihilate Russia as an historical fact, as an historical force; it means carrying out a great violation on the thousand-year-old people than the Tatar khans or the usurpers of the Time of Troubles carried out…"[152]

This speech was clearly critical of the government. And yet Archbishop Anthony was no liberal, and in February, 1907 he wrote as follows about the monarchy: "Perhaps there are countries which are best ruled not by tsars, but by many leaders. But our kingdom, which consists of a multitude of races, various faiths and customs that are hostile to each other, can stand only when at its head there stands one Anointed of God, who gives account to nobody except God and His commandments. Otherwise all the races that inhabit the Russian land would go against each other with knives, and would not be pacified until they had themselves destroyed each other, or had submitted to the power of the enemies of Russia. Only the White Tsar is venerated by all the peoples of Russia; for his sake they obey the civil laws, go into the army and pay their taxes. Our tsars are the friends of the people and preservers of the holy faith, and the present Sovereign Nicholas Alexandrovich is the meekest and quietest of all the kings of the whole world. He is the crown of our devotion to our native land and you must stand for him to your last drop of blood, not allowing anybody to diminish his sacred power, for with the fall of this power, Russia also will fall…

"Russian man, lend your ear to your native land: what does it tell you? 'From the righteous Princess Olga, from the equal-to-the-apostles Vladimir until the days of Seraphim of Sarov and to the present day and to future ages all the wise leaders of my people think and say the same,' that is what the land will reply to you… 'They taught their contemporaries and their descendants one and the same thing: both the princes, and the tsars, and the hierarchs who sat on the Church sees, and the hermits who hid amidst the

[152] Archbishop Anthony, in Rklitsky, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 277, 278-281.

forest and on the islands of the sea, and the military commanders, and the warriors, and the boyars, and the simple people: they all taught to look on this life as the entrance courtyard into the future life, they all taught to use it in such a way as not to console the flesh, but to raise the soul to evangelical virtue, to preserve the apostolic faith unharmed, to keep the purity of morals and truthfulness of speech, to honour the tsars and those placed in authority by them, to listen to and venerate the sacred monastic order, not to envy the rich, but to compete with the righteous ones, to love to work the land as indicated by God to our race through Adam and Noah, and to turn to other crafts only out of necessity or because of a special talent; not to borrow the corrupt habits of foreigners, their proud, lying and adulterous morals, but to preserve the order of the fatherland, which is fulfilled through chastity, simplicity and evangelical love; to stand fearlessly for your native land on the field of battle and to study the law of God in the sacred books.' That is what our land teaches us, that is what the wise men and righteous ones of all epochs of our history entrusted to us, in which there was no disagreement between them, but complete unanimity. The whole of Rus' thinks in the same way. But she knows that only the Anointed of God must preserve this spirit and defend it from enemies visible and invisible by his mighty right hand. And look he hardly stepped back from life when his popular privileges were snatched from him by deception and violence by his enemies and the enemies of the people. Yes, the Russian people thinks and feels one thing: in its eyes public life is a general exploit of virtue, and not the realm of secular pleasures, it is the laborious increase of the Kingdom of God amongst us ourselves and its implanting in the unenlightened tribes, and not the equalisation of all faiths and superstitions. The Orthodox people knows and feels this. It feels that without one ruling royal right hand it is impossible for our land of many tribes to exist. In it are 102 different faiths, 102 tribes that will now nourish malicious enmity against each other immediately they cease to feel the ruling right hand of the White Tsar above them. Let him hear out the reports of the people's delegates, let him allow them to express their opinions on various matters of the kingdom. But the final decision will be made by him himself, and he will give an account for this only through his conscience before the Lord God. One only submission, one only limitation of his power is necessary to the people: that openly on the day of his crowning he should confess his Orthodox faith to God and the people in accordance with the Symbol of the Fatherland – so that he should not have human arbitrariness, but the evangelical law of God as his unfailing guide in his sovereign decisions and undertakings. That is the kingdom we need, and this is understood not only by Russian people, but also by people other faiths who live in our land with a healthy people's reasoning, and not through lies and deceit: both Tatars and Kirgiz and the old Jews who believe in their own way, and the distant Tunguz. All of them know that shaking the Tsar's Autocracy means beginning the destruction of the whole of Russia, which has been confirmed in the last three years…"[153]

[153] Rklitsky, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 173, 175-177.

So the problem, according to Archbishop Anthony, was not in the institution of the monarchy, to which he was passionately attached, but in the Petrine system of Church-State relations, whereby "the government of the 18th century tore away the clergy from the people, driving the former into the ranks of a separate caste," so that "the people was further and further estranged from Church literature and Church services" and heretical propaganda was able to gain a stronger and stronger influence among them. And yet how was the Petrine system to be reformed in order to give the Church more independence and influence among the people without further undermining the monarchy itself in those revolutionary times? This was the conundrum that faced all would-be reformers from the right end of the political spectrum, and the real reason why no truly effective reform was possible before the revolution…

In the meantime, Archbishop Anthony waged a noble battle against the heretics within his own diocese and also in defence of the Orthodox population further west, within the bounds of Austria-Hungary. For there the Hungarian government and the uniates tried by all means to prevent the return of the Carpatho-Russians to their ancestral Orthodox faith. This led to martyrdoms, such as that of the priest Maximus Sandovich, who had been ordained by Vladyka Anthony.[154]

"Vladyka Anthony struggled with the unia and both by the printed word and in his sermons he often addressed this theme. He tried by all means to destroy the incorrect attitude towards the unia which had been established in Russia, according to which it was the same Orthodoxy, only commemorating the Pope of Rome. With profound sorrow and irritation he said: 'They can in no way accept this simple truth, that the unia is a complete entry into the Roman Catholic church with the recognition of the Orthodox Church as a schism.., with the recognition of all the Latin saints and with a condemnation of the Orthodox saints as having been schismatics outside the true Church…'

"… Vladyka Anthony also laboured much to establish in Russian society an Orthodox attitude towards Catholicism. In educated Russian society and in ecclesiastical circles in the Synodal period of the Russian Church the opinion was widespread that Catholicism was one of the branches of Christianity which, as V.S. Soloviev taught, was bound at the end of time to unite into one Christianity with the other supposed branches – Orthodoxy and Protestantism, about which the holy Church supposedly prayed in her litanies: 'For the prosperity of the Holy Churches of God and for the union of all'.

"The correct attitude towards Catholicism as an apostate heresy was so shaken that the Holy Synod under the influence of the Emperor Peter I and with the blessing of his favourite, the protestantising Metropolitan Theophan Prokopovich, allowed Swedish prisoners-of-war in Siberia to marry Russian

[154] *Holy New Hieromartyr Maximus Sandovich*, Liberty, Tenn.: St. John of Kronstadt Press, 1998.

girls with the obligatory conversion to Orthodoxy. Soon this uncanonical practice of mixed marriages became law and spread, especially in the western regions. In his diocese Vladyka Anthony strictly forbade the clergy to celebrate mixed marriages.

"Vladyka Anthony well knew that Catholic influence in the midst of the Russian clergy was introduced through the theological schools: 'We have lost (an Orthodox attitude towards Catholicism) because those guides by which we studied in school and which constitute the substance of our theological, dogmatic and moral science, is borrowed from the Catholics and Protestants; we are left only with straight heterodox errors which are known to all and have been condemned by ecclesiastical authorities…'

"Seeing the abnormal situation of church life in subjugated Carpathian Rus', Vladyka Anthony turned to the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III with a request to accept the Orthodox Galicians and Carpatho-Russians under his omophorion, since the Russian Synod for political reasons was unable to spread its influence there. The patriarch willingly agreed and appointed Vladyka Anthony as his exarch for Galicia and Carpathian Rus'. The Galicians, after finishing work in the fields and in spite of the great obstacles involved in crossing the border, sometimes with a direct danger to their lives, made pilgrimages in large groups to the Pochaev Lavra. Many Carpatho-Russians and Galicians entered the Volhynia theological seminary.

"Under the influence of all these undertakings, the Orthodox movement in these areas began to grow in an elemental manner with each year that passed. This elicited repressions on the part of the Austro-Hungarian government, which tried to suppress the movement. The persecution grew and soon Vladyka was forced to speak out in defence of the persecuted Christians. In August, 1913 he published an encyclical letter in which he eloquently portrayed all the woes and persecutions of the Orthodox population of the western regions. In going through the various instances of Catholics humiliating Orthodox, he cited the following example of the firmness of the persecuted and the cruelty of the persecutors: 'Virgins who had gathered together to save their souls in fasting and prayer were stripped in winter and driven out onto a frozen lake, like the 40 martyrs of Sebaste, after which some of them soon died. Thus do they torture our Russians in Hungary and Austria in broad daylight in our civilized age…'

"But when massive arrests and tortures of the Orthodox began, and there was a trial of 94 Orthodox in Sihet, Vladyka Anthony composed a special prayer and petitions in the litanies, which were read in all the churches of the Volhynia diocese in the course of the whole period of the trial, which lasted for two months.

"This was the only voice raised in defence of the persecuted, not only in Russia but also throughout Europe.

"The Austro-Hungarian political circles, in agreement with the Vatican, undertook decisive measures to suppress the incipient mass return to Orthodoxy of the Carpatho-Russians and Galicians. It seems that they undertook diplomatic negotiations in St. Petersburg in order to remove the main cause of the movement that had arisen, Vladyka Anthony, from his Volhynia see."[155]

On May 20, 1914 Archbishop Anthony was duly transferred from the see of Volhynia to that of Kharkov… However, where human leaders fail, the King of kings intervenes. The outbreak of the First World War in 1914, and the success of the Russian offensive in Galicia in 1915, removed – temporarily, at any rate – many of the dangers which had arisen in the pre-war period and against which Archbishop Anthony had struggled. Patriotic emotion and reverence for the Tsar revived, and concern for the fate of the Orthodox Christians in Serbia and the south-west regions made the struggle, in the minds of many, into a holy war in defence of Orthodoxy against militant Catholicism and Protestantism.

[155] *Holy New Hieromartyr Maximus Sandovich*, op. cit., pp. 48-50.

18. GEORGIAN AUTOCEPHALY

Another region of the empire in which the government's liberal decrees of 1905 caused problems was Georgia… Now the Georgian Church is much older than the Russian - it was granted autocephaly in the fourth century in accordance with a decision of the Council of Antioch. Her golden age took place from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, until the arrival of the Mongols in the 1220s. Thereafter Georgian history consisted of a long succession of invasions by Mongols, Turks and Persians in which the country was repeatedly devastated and many thousands martyred for the Orthodox faith.

In the sixteenth century Georgia found herself in a terrible plight. For, as Ioseliani writes, "oppressed by internal discord, and by the dissensions of ambitious and unsettled princes, Georgia was again exposed to a severe persecution on the part of the Persians. These enemies of the Christian name ceased not to lay their sacrilegious hands on the riches of Iberia. The messengers of King Alexander to Moscow lamented the fearful misfortunes of their country, and represented how the great Shah-Abbas, having endeavoured to leave to himself the protection of the kingdom of Georgia, made in reality the Georgians enemies of the Russian Tzar.

"In the year 1587 King Alexander II, having declared himself a vassal of Russia, sent to Moscow the priests Joachim, Cyril, and others; and, pressed on all sides as he was by the Persians and the Turks, entreated with tears the Russian Tzar Theodore Iohannovitch to take Iberia under his protection, and thus to rescue her from the grasp of infidels. 'The present disastrous times,' wrote he, 'for the Christian faith were foreseen by many men inspired by God. We, brethren of the same faith with the Russians, groan under the hand of wicked men. Thou, crowned head of the Orthodox faith, canst alone save both our lives and our souls. I bow to thee with my face to the earth, with all my people, and we shall be thine forever.' The Tsar Theodore Iohannovitch having taken Iberia under his protection, busied himself earnestly in rendering her assistance and in works of faith. He sent into Georgia teachers in holy orders for the regulation of Church ceremonies, and painters to decorate the temples with images of saints; and Job, patriarch of all the Russias, addressed to the Georgian king a letter touching the faith. King Alexander humbly replied that the favourable answer of the Tsar had fallen upon him from Heaven, and brought him out of darkness into light; that the clergy of the Russian Church were angels for the clergy of Iberia, buried in ignorance. The Prince Zvenigorod, ambassador to Georgia, promised in the name of Russia the freedom of all Georgia, and the restoration of all her churches and monasteries."[156]

[156] P. Ioseliani, *A Short History of the Georgian Church*, Jordanville, N.Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1983, pp. 146-148.

However, because of her internal and external troubles, Russia was not able to offer significant military aid to Georgia for some time. And so "in 1617," writes A.P. Dobroklonsky, "Georgia was again subjected to destruction from the Persians: the churches were devastated, the land was ravaged. Therefore in 1619 Teimuraz, king of Kakhetia, Imeretia and Kartalinia, accepted Russian citizenship, and Persia was restrained from war by peaceful negotiations. But the peace was not stable. In 1634 the Persian Shah placed the Crown Prince Rostom on the throne of Kartalinia. He accepted Islam, and began to drive the Orthodox out of Kartalinia. The renewal of raids on Georgia had a disturbing effect on ecclesiastical affairs there, so that in 1637 an archimandrite, two priests and two icon-painters with a craftsman and materials for the construction of churches were sent from Moscow 'to review and correct the peasants' faith'. And in 1650 Prince Alexander of Imeretia and in 1658 Teimuraz of Kakhetia renewed their oath of allegiance to the Russian Tsar. Nevertheless, even after this the woes continued. Many Georgians, restricted by the Muslims in their homeland, fled to Russia and there found refuge. But Georgia did not receive any real help from Russia throughout this period.

"As regard the Orthodox Greeks who were suffering under the Turkish yoke, Russia gave them generous material assistance, and sometimes tried to ease the yoke of the Turkish government that was weighing on them…"[157]

All this demonstrated that the Russian tsar and patriarch were now in essentially the same relationship with the Eastern Orthodox Christians as the Constantinopolitan emperors and patriarchs had been centuries before, and that Russia had taken the place of Constantinople in God's Providential Plan for His Church, a fact which the Eastern Patriarchs were now ready to accept.

"The Russian army," writes Lado Mirianashvili, "finally freed Georgia from the unremitting incursions at the end of the 18th century. In 1783 the kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti (central and eastern Georgia) concluded the Georgievsk treaty with Russia. According to the treaty Russia was to assume responsibility for protecting Georgia's borders in return for the free movement of Russian troops within the country. But by 1801 Russia had abrogated the treaty and annexed Kartli-Kakheti. This was followed by the annexation of Samegrelo and Imereti (western Georgia) in 1803 and 1804, respectively. Within ten years the Russian authorities had abolished the Georgian monarchy, the Church's autocephaly, and the patriarchal throne – all of which had withstood the Turks, the Mongols, and the Persians. During the subsequent 106 years, nineteen exarches of the Russian Synod ruled the Georgian Church. Church services in Georgian were terminated, frescoes

[157] Dobroklonsky, *Rukovodstvo po istorii russkoj tserkvi* (Guide to the History of the Russian Church), Moscow, 2001, pp. 278-279.

were whitewashed, and ancient Georgian icons and manuscripts were either sold or destroyed."[158]

In spite of these abuses, there is little doubt that on the whole Georgia benefited from being part of the Russian empire. And Georgian saints of the nineteenth century, such as Elder Ilarion of Mount Athos, could be sincerely, even fiercely pro-Russian. Nevertheless, the trampling underfoot of an ancient Christian nation's traditions could not go unopposed for long, and a movement to preserve the nation's heritage and promote the cause of Georgian state independence and ecclesiastical autocephaly came into being under the leadership of the poet, historian and philosopher Ilia Chavchavadze, who was assassinated by revolutionaries in 1907.

Georgian *State* independence could not be considered then, since at a time of increasing nationalist and revolutionary tensions, it would only undermine the foundations of the whole Orthodox empire. However, *Church* autocephaly was a different matter in view of the undisputed fact that the Georgian Church had once been autocephalous. And on June 2, 1906 this question was reviewed in the Alexander Nevsky Lavra in St. Petersburg during the sessions of the second section of the Preconciliar Convention.

Eugene Pavlenko writes: "The majority of those who spoke supported the state principle of Church division [that is, in one state there should be only one Church administration], but the minority insisted on a national or ethnic point of view. In winding up the second section of the Preconciliar Convention, participants accepted one of the two projects of Protopriest I. Vostorgov on giving the Georgian Church greater independence in the sphere of the use of the Georgian liturgical language, of the appointment of national Georgian clergy, etc., but the project for Georgian autocephaly was rejected."

The argument between the two sides is important and its conclusions applicable in other cases, so we shall follow it in Pavlenko's exposition: "The most completely phyletistic [nationalistic] argumentation of the supporters of the idea of Georgian autocephaly at the Preconciliar Consistory was sounded in the report of Bishop Kirion [Sadzagelov, of Sukhumi], 'The National Principle in the Church'.[159]

This report began by proclaiming the principle of nationality in the Church and by affirming its antiquity. In the opinion of the Bishop, Georgia 'has the right to the independent existence of her national Church on the basis of the principle of nationality in the Church proclaimed at the beginning of the Christian faith.' What does principle consist of, and when was it proclaimed? 'It is sufficient to remember,' writes Bishop Kirion, 'the descent of the Holy

---

[158] Archpriest Zakaria Michitadze, *Lives of the Georgian Saints,* Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 2006, pp. 25-27.

[159] *Journals and Protocols of the sessions of the Preconciliar Convention Established by His Majesty*, volume 3. On the second section on Georgia. St. Petersburg, 1907, pp. 55-58.

Spirit on the apostles, who immediately began to glorify God in various languages and then preached the Gospel to the pagans, each in their native language.' But in our [Pavlenko's] view, references to the preaching of the apostles in connection with the affirmation of the national principle in the Church have no firm foundation. The preaching of the apostles in various languages was necessary in order to unite the peoples in the Truth of Christ, and not in order to disunite them in accordance with the national principle. That is, the principle of nationality is precisely that which Christianity has to overcome, and not that on which the Church must be founded. Since the Bulgarian schism phyletistic argumentation has characteristically sought support in references to the 34th Apostolic canon. 'The basic canonical rule,' writes Bishop Kirion, 'by which the significance of nationality in relation to Church administration is recognised, is the 34th Apostolic canon which is so well known to canonists… According to the direct meaning of this canon in the Orthodox Church, every nationality must have its first hierarch.' But the 34th Apostolic canon… has in view 'bishops of every territory' and not 'bishops of every people'. The word ethnos, which is employed in this canon in the ancient language and in the language of Christian antiquity, is translated in the dictionary of Liddell and Scott first of all as 'a number of people accustomed to live together', and only then as 'a nation'. It is precisely the first sense indicated here that points to the territorial meaning of the Apostolic canon. So references to its national meaning are groundless.

"An incorrect understanding and use of the principle of conciliarity – which phyletism has in common with ecumenism – sometimes brings them closer, as we shall see later, to the point of being completely indistinguishable. For the supporters of the division of the Church along tribal lines the principle of conciliarity is only a convenient federal form for the development by each people of its nationality idiosyncracy. '… The federal system,' in the opinion of Bishop Kirion, 'gave our Eastern Church significant advantages from a national point of view.' And the preservation of this idiosyncracy – in his opinion – is prescribed by conciliar decisions (cf. the 39th canon of the Council in Trullo), and acquires a very important significance from the point of view of Church freedom.' But in the 39th canon of the Council in Trullo not a word is said about 'national religious-everyday and individual particularities' and the like, but there is mention of the rights of first-hierarchs over bishops and their appointment. 'Let the customs of each [autocephalous] Church be observed,' it says in this canon, 'so that the bishop of each district should be subject to his president, and that he, in his turn, should be appointed from his bishops, according to the ancient custom.' The émigré Church of Cyprus, of which mention is made in this canon, did not become the national Church of the Cypriots, but took into herself all the peoples of the Hellespont district where they emigrated. Where is mention made here of a conciliar sanction for the preservation of 'local ecclesiastical traditions' with the aid of administrative isolation?

"'Ecclesiastically speaking,' thinks Bishop Kirion, 'each people must make use of the freedom of self-determination' and 'possesses the right to develop

according to the laws of its own national spirit.' The extent to which the Bishop sees the development of each Church possible 'according to the laws of its own national spirit' becomes clear from the following quotation cited by him: 'The Bulgarian Church, after a period of difficult trials and struggle, is near to the realisation of its age-old strivings without disrupting Christian peace and love. The enslaved Syro-Arabic Church is declaring its rights to national idiosyncracy more and more persistently. The Armenian, Syro-Jacobite and Perso-Chaldean Churches, which have, because of regrettable circumstances, been separated from ecumenical unity for a long time, are also seeking reunion, but without the disruption of their national rights which have come into being historically.'[160] By 'regrettable circumstances' Professor Kavalnitsky and Bishop Kirion who quotes him apparently have in mind the Council of Chalcedon, which condemned the monophysite heretics. While by 'reunion' they have in mind, as becomes clear from the following sentence, the following: 'Unity between the Churches must take place on the principle of equality, and not of absorption.'[161] Thus both in the schism of the Bulgarians, and in the heresy of monophysitism, there is nothing to prevent union with them, but only, in the opinion of Bishop Kirion, 'the religious variety of the Christian peoples'! Before our eyes, Bishop Kirion, a defender of Georgian autocephaly at the beginning of the century, is making a path from phyletism to ecumenism, the union of which we have already distinctly observed at the end of the century. This is the classical 'branch theory' in action. 'The peoples who accepted Christianity did not all assimilate its lofty teaching in the same way; each took from it only those elements of Christian life which it was able to in accordance with its intellectual and moral character. The Latin nations (the Catholics) developed a strict ecclesiastical organisation and created architecture of high artistic value. The Greeks, who were experienced in dialectical subtleties, worked out a complex and firmly based dogmatic system. The Russians, on accepting Christianity, mainly developed discipline and church rubrics, bringing external beauty to a high level of development. But the Georgians, having christianised their age-old national beliefs [giving their paganism a Christian form? – the author] and being completely penetrated with the spirit of Christianity, attached to it the sympathetic traits of their own character: meekness, simplicity, warmth, self-sacrifice, freedom from malice and persistence. Although all the nations did not receive Christianity, in the sense of assimilate the height and fullness of its heavenly teaching, in the same way, nevertheless, enlightened by Christianity, as members of the one Body of Christ [one must suppose that Latins and Monophysites are included in this number – the author], strive for the one aim that is common to Christian humanity – the realisation of the kingdom of God on earth (?!)'. The idea of chiliasm – 'the kingdom of God on earth' – is a worthy crown of this union of phyletism and ecumenism. Fitting for a report at the assembly of the World Council of Churches, whose members are expecting the coming of 'the new era of the Holy Spirit'?

---

[160] Professor M.G. Kovalnitsky. *On the Significance of the National Element in the Historical Development of Christianity*, Kiev, 1880, pp. 3-4.
[161] *Journals and Protocols*, p. 56.

"From Bishop Kirion's report it is clearly evident that the idea of the national Church, beginning with the division of the Church on national lines, leads to her 'union', not on the basis of the patristic faith, but on the basis of the idea of abstract 'equality' of separate, including heretical, churches, and through this to the idea of the coming earthly kingdom of the antichrist…"[162]

There are stronger arguments to be made for Georgian autocephaly than those put forward by Bishop Kirion. However, Pavlenko is right to reject his essentially phyletistic argument: one (ethnic) nation – one Church. From the earliest times, the Orthodox Church has been organized on a *territorial* basis, following the demarcation of *states* rather than ethnic groups. In more recent centuries state boundaries have tended to correspond more and more closely to ethnic boundaries, so that we now talk of the Greek Church, the Russian Church, the Serbian Church, etc., as if we are talking about the Churches of the ethnic Greeks, Russians and Serbs exclusively. But this is a misleading way of speaking, and does not alter the essential principle, confirmed both in Holy Scripture and in Canon Law, that a local Church is the Church of all the people, *of all nationalities,* gathered together on one territory.

The attempt to substitute the ethnic principle for the territorial principle led, as we have seen, to a schism between the Greek and the Bulgarian Churches in 1872. It would lead to a schism between the Russian and the Georgian Churches in 1917, when Bishop Kirion and a Council of the Georgian Church re-established Georgian Church autocephaly on the basis of the ethnic principle. It would thereby divide the two Churches at precisely the moment when unity between Orthodox Christians of all races was vital in the face of the international communist revolution…

[162] Eugene Pavlenko, "The Heresy of Phyletism: History and the Present", *Vertograd-Inform*, September, 1999.

19. THE BEILIS TRIAL AND THE JEWISH "BLOOD LIBEL"

In 1911, a Christian boy, Andrew Yuschinsky, was killed in Kiev. In connection with this, in 1913, the trial took place of a Jew named Beilis, which became an international cause célèbre. The verdict of the court was that the boy had been ritually murdered. However, Beilis himself was acquitted (because witnesses and jurors were suborned, according to many).[163] In order to understand the significance of this trial, it is necessary briefly to review the roots of "the Jewish question" in Russia and of the so-called Jewish "blood libel".

By 1914 there were about seven million Jews in the Russian empire – the largest non-Slavic ethnic minority. Most of them lived in the Pale of Settlement, a very large area in the west of Russia approximately the size of France and Germany combined. Russian law, very loosely observed, confined them to this area, but on religious, not racial grounds - the sacred book of the Jews, the Talmud, is so hostile to Christ and Christians that those who follow it were deemed to be a threat to the lives and livelihoods of Christians. That these restrictions were indeed religious and not racial is proved by the fact that the Karaite Jews, who did not accept the Talmud, the Mountain Jews of the Caucasus, who were strongly tainted with paganism, and Jews who became Christians of any denomination, were given equal rights with the rest of the population.[164]

Moreover, permission to live outside the Pale was given to various categories of Jews: Siberian colonists, domestic servants, artisans, university graduates (one-fifth of the students of Kharkov university were Jews), businessmen, industrialists, bankers and others. This meant that in spite of the discriminatory laws there were considerable colonies of Jews throughout the empire and even in the capital, which enabled them to play a prominent role in the cultural and commercial life of pre-revolutionary Russia. In all, Jews made up about a third of Russia's total trading community.

In spite of the considerable opportunities thus presented to Jews in the Russian Empire, the traditionalist, rabbi-dominated Talmudic Jews of the Pale continued to think of Christians and Christian society as unclean and despicable. "The eminent Jewish-Russian lawyer, Genrikh Sliozberg," write Fitzlyon and Browning, "never forgot the 'real grief' of his family and relations when they discovered that his father had sent him to a Russian grammar school. His school uniform they found particularly irritating, sinful even. It was, they thought, 'an apostate's garb', and his mother and grandmother cried bitterly every time they saw him in it.' Again, 'the

[163] See Danilushkin, op. cit., pp. 784-793; Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 444-451.

[164] "Let us remember," writes Solzhenitsyn: "the legal restrictions on the Jews in Russia were never racial [as they were in Western Europe]. They were applied neither to the Karaites [who rejected the Talmud], nor to the mountain Jews, nor to the Central Asian Jews." (op. cit., p. 292).

Russian-Jewish revolutionary, Lev Deutsch, writing in 1923, clearly remembered the time when the Jews 'considered it sinful to learn Russian, and its use was allowed only if absolutely essential and, of course, only for speaking to Christians (the goyim).'"[165]

It was in this fanatical atmosphere that both Communist and Zionist propaganda made inroads into Jewish youth. As Chaim Weitzmann recalled in his *Autobiography*, zealots of both types were to be found in his own family, being united only in their hatred of Orthodox Russia.[166] Such sentiments were bound to lead to a reaction on the part of the surrounding population. Moreover, Jewish money-lenders exploited Russian peasants who wished to buy their freedom after Alexander II's emancipation of the serfs in 1861. The government tried to help with generous, low-interest loans, and on several occasions cancelled the debts outright; but the remaining need was filled by less generous Jews, who stepped in with much tougher, high-interest loans.

The pogroms of the oppressed Ukrainian peasantry against the oppressor Jewish money-lenders provided the excuse which international Jewry, together with its "Christian" front, the secularised intelligentsia of Russia and the West, needed. Soon a vast campaign was being whipped up against "the sick man of Europe", the so-called "prison of the peoples". Jewish and Socialist propaganda distorted the significance of these events, obscuring their causes, hiding the extremely provocative behaviour of Jewish gangs, and quite unjustly accusing the Church and the State, and in particular the Tsar, of complicity in these crimes.

The innocence of the government and Tsar is illustrated by their reaction to the assassination by the Jewish revolutionary Bogrov of Prime Minister A.A. Stolypin in Kiev Opera House in 1911. Robert Massie writes: "Because Bogrov was a Jew, the Orthodox population was noisily preparing a retaliatory pogrom. Frantic with fear, the city's Jewish population spent the night packing their belongings. The first light of the following day found the square before the railway station jammed with carts and people trying to squeeze themselves on to departing trains. Even as they waited, the terrified people heard the clatter of hoofs. An endless stream of Cossacks, their long lances dark against the dawn sky, rode past. On his own, Kokovtsev had ordered three full regiments of Cossacks into the city to prevent violence. Asked on what authority he had issued the command, Kokovtsev replied: 'As head of the government.' Later, a local official came up to the Finance Minister to complain, 'Well, Your Excellency, by calling in the troops you have missed a fine chance to answer Bogrov's shot with a nice Jewish pogrom.' Kokovtsov was indignant, but, he added, 'his sally suggested to me that the measures which I had taken at Kiev were not sufficient… therefore I sent an open telegram to all governors of the region demanding that they use every

[165] Kyril Fitzlyon and Tatiana Browning, *Russia Before the Revolution*, Harmondsworth: Penguin books, 1977, p. 46.
[166] *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weitzmann*, New York: Harper, 1949.

possible means – force if necessary – to prevent possible pogroms. When I submitted this telegram to the Tsar, he expressed his approval of it and of the measure I had taken in Kiev.'"[167]

In 1906 the future Hieromartyr John Vostorgov said: "The Jews are restricted in their rights of residence not as a confessional unit, but as a predatory tribe that is dangerous in the midst of the peaceful population because of its exploitative inclinations, which… have found a religious sanction and support in the Talmud… Can such a confession be tolerated in the State, when it allows its followers to practise hatred and all kinds of deceit and harm towards other confessions, and especially Christians? … The establishment of the Pale of Settlement is the softest of all possible measures in relation to such a confession. Moreover, is it possible in this case not to take account of the mood of the masses? But this mood cannot be changed only by issuing a law on the complete equality of rights of the Jews. On the contrary, this can only strengthen the embitterment of the people…"[168]

Now stories of ritual murder of Christian children by Jews have surfaced in many countries in many ages, leading to many formal trials and convictions. These are completely dismissed by western authors, who speak about the "blood libel" against the Jews. However, in 2007 the Israelite Professor Ariel Toaff, the son of the Chief Rabbi of Rome, published *Confirming Judaic Ritual Murder,* in which he confirms the practice in fifteenth-century Italy.[169] Moreover, the Orthodox Church has canonized at least one victim of such a murder, Child-Martyr Gabriel of Zverki, Belorussia, to whom Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) wrote a service in 1908.[170] It is significant that in 1919 the Bolsheviks banned the chanting of hymns to the Child-Martyr Gabriel, whose relics reposed in the church of St. Basil the Blessed on Red Square.[171]

In 1855 Bishop Porphyrius (Uspensky) of Chigirinsk wrote to the director of the Department of foreign confessions, Khruschev: "Just as the Christian peoples have retained many pagan superstitions, so the Jews – it goes without saying, not all of them – continue to shed the blood of children and youths who are not of their tribe according to very ancient tradition, which points to the redemption of their whole race in a bloody human sacrifice… In the East everyone is convinced that the killing of Christian boys by the Jews is ordered in such a way that this evil is accomplished in one year in Thessalonica, for

---

[167] Massie, *Nicolas and Alexandra*, London: Book Club Associates, 1967, p. 229.
[168] Vostorgov, in Fomin and Fomina, op. cit., vol. II, p. 624.
[169] http://www.revisionisthistory.org/page10.page10.html.
[170] S.V. Bulgakov, *Nastol'naia Kniga dlya Svyashchenno-Tserkovno-Sluzhitelia* (Handbook for Church Servers), Kharkov, 1900, p. 143. For ritual murders demonstrated in court, see Dal', V. *Rozyskanie o ubiyenii evreev khristianskikh mladentsev i upotreblenii krovi ikh* (Investigation into the Killing by Jews of Christian Children and the Use of their Blood), St. Petersburg, 1844; Rozanov, V. *Oboniatel'noe i osyazatel'noe otnoshenie evreev k krovi* (The Senses of Smell and Touch of the Jews towards Blood), St. Petersburg, 1913; O. Platonov, *Ternovij venets Rossii* (Russia's Crown of Thorns), Moscow, 1998.
[171] Vladimir Rusak, *Pir Satany* (Satan's Feast), London, Ontario: Zarya, 1991, p. 13.

example, in another in Damascus, in a third in Spain, or Russia, or Wallachia, etc., and that the towels soaked in the blood of the unfortunate victim are burned, and their ashes are scattered to all the synagogues so that they can be baked into the paschal bread… Judge, after this, how difficult it is to catch the terrible crime… I sorrow over the existence of such a horror among the Jews… And Jews have penetrated onto Athos, and one of them in the rank of hieromonk and spiritual father killed monks coming to him for confession, and hid their corpses under his floor…"[172]

It is the tendency of pro-semite authors to dismiss all this as "anti-semitic lies". However, even if all the historical evidence of Jewish atrocities could be dismissed, it would be surprising indeed if a religion steeped in such hatred against Christ and Christians as Talmudic Judaism did not produce *acts* of hatred. As long as incitement to such acts exists in the "sacred" book of the Judaistic religion, there must be a presumption that some of its followers may be tempted to carry them out.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that Christians also acted with hatred and committed atrocities, as in the pogroms in the Rhineland in 1096 or in Spain leading to the expulsion of all the Jews from Spain in 1492, or in Russia before the revolution. Hatred of enemies is forbidden by the Gospel of Christ; so such acts, whether or not they were provoked by hatred on the Jews' side, cannot be condoned. But the justified horror at Christian antisemitism which has become so de rigeur in the modern world, must always be balanced by a similar horror at the antigentilism and antichristianity of the Talmud, the most hateful of all "sacred" books.

Over a hundred well-documented cases of the murder of Christian children by the Jews for ritual purposes in various countries are cited by Oleg Platonov. Especially valuable is his citing of the evidence of Monk Neophytus, until the age of 38 a Jewish rabbi who then became a monk of the Greek Church, who exposed, not only the real existence of this horrific practice, but also the religious rationale behind it. His book, entitled *A Refutation of the Religion of the Jews and their Rites from the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, originally appeared in Moldavian in 1803 and was translated into Russian in St. Petersburg in 1913, the year of the Beilis trial:-

"The secret use of blood, which the Jews collect from Christians killed by them is a rite which they consider to have been commanded by God Himself and indicated in certain mysterious expressions in the Scriptures.

"Many scholars have written works aimed at proving, with the help of the Bible, the appearance of the true Messiah promised by God to our fathers, Who is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the All-Pure Virgin Mary. An innumerable quantity of works have also been written to refute the superstitious beliefs of the Jews and their false teachings. Many of these

[172] Uspensky, in Fomin and Fomina, op. cit., vol. II, p. 632.

authors were native Jews who converted to the Christian Faith. Meanwhile, nobody has yet published anything serious concerning this barbaric mystery of blood, which is kept and used by the synagogue. If some book hinting at this mystery happens to fall into the hands of Christians, and they make reference to it, the Jews never reply in any other way than with feigned mockery or evasions, like the following: 'But how would we kill Christians if the law forbids us to eat blood?'

"In my opinion, the reason preventing the Jews, even those converted to Christianity, from clearly exposing this is hidden either in the fact that they really were not initiated into the mystery, or in the fact that they still foolishly pity our unfortunate people, and fear to attract to it the powerful vengeance of the Christian peoples.

"But I, having by the mercy of God received Holy Baptism and monasticism, have no fear, in the interest of Christians, to declare everything that I know about these rites, which I myself zealously carried out and kept in the strictest secrecy all the time that I was a haham, or rabbi.

"But first of all it is necessary to explain that the mystery of blood is not known to all Jews, but only to the hahams, or rabbis, the scribes, or Pharisees, who for that reason are called the keepers of the mystery of the blood – a mystery which, moreover, is not contained in clear words in any of their books and which they pass on exclusively by oral tradition.

"The fathers of families initiated into the mystery pass it on only to that one of their sons whose secrecy they have tested. Also, they insist that he is obliged to pass on the mystery only under those condition and in that form, and that he should never disclose it to a Christian, even in the cruellest woes, and even for the saving of life. This revelation is accompanied by the most terrifying curses on anyone who gives away the secret. Here, for example, is how I was initiated into it myself.

"When I reached the age of thirteen, - the age at which the Jews have the custom of laying a wreath called the wreath of glory on the heads of their sons, - my father went apart with me and had a long talk with me, instilling hatred for the Christians into me as a duty laid down by God. This hatred was to go as far as killing them. Then he told me of the custom of collecting the blood of the murdered, and he added, embracing me: 'So, my son, in this way I have made you confidant and as it were my second I.' Then he put the wreath on my head and in great detail explained to me the mystery of the blood as the holiest of the holies and the important rite of the Jewish religion. 'My son,' he continued, 'I abjure you by all the elements of heaven and earth always to keep this secret in your heart and not to entrust it to anyone, neither your brothers, nor your sisters, not your mother, nor, later, your wife, - not to any mortal, and especially women. If God gives you even eleven grown sons, do not reveal the secret to all of them, but only to one – the one whom you recognise to be the cleverest and the most capable of keeping the secret, just

as I am now acting with you. You must take great car that this son of yours should be devoted and zealous for our faith. Once more I adjure you: beware of trusting women, even your daughters, your wife and your mother, but trust only the son whom you consider worthy of trust.' 'O my son,' he cried finally, 'may the whole earth refuse to accept your corpse and thrust you out from its depths, if, even in conditions of the most extreme necessity, you reveal this secret of blood to anyone besides him of whom I have spoken. Even if you become a Christian for the sake of profit or for other reasons. See that you do not betray your father by giving away this divine secret which I have revealed to you today. Otherwise may my curse strike you at the very hour at which you sin, and may it accompany you all the days of your life until death and to the ages of ages.'

"May the Father Whom I have acquired in heaven and Who is the Lord Jesus Christ turn away these curses from the head of him who writes exclusively for the sake of the benefit of the Church and the triumph of the Truth.

"The bases of this barbaric custom are the following: 1) hatred for Christians, 2) superstition, and 3) faith in the spiritual reality of Christian blood. I shall explain each of these points.

"On the first reason, which is hatred for Christians.

"The Jews as it were from their mother's breast instil hatred of Christianity into their sons from the earliest childhood. On receiving these convictions from their fathers over a whole series of generations, they are really and sincerely convinced that to despise Christians and even to kill them is very pleasing to God, thereby exactly justifying the words of Divine redemption: 'everyone who kills you will think that he is thereby serving God' (John 16.20).

"On the second reason, which is superstition.

"The second reason is based on the superstitious beliefs which the Jews hold and which relate to the sphere of magic, sorcery, the kabbala and other mysterious rites. They believe that Christian blood is necessary for these diabolical operations. Out of all these superstitions I will indicate only one, which concerns the curse of God that fell on the unhappy people of Israel and which was prophesied by Moses himself in the following expressions: 'the Lord will strike you with Egyptian leprosy… a foul leprosy on the knees and shins from which you will not be able to be healed' (Deuteronomy 28.27, 35).

"This terrible illness always was and is very common among the Jews – much more common than they think… And when the haham visits the sick who have been struck down by it, and gives them medicines, he at the same time sprinkles them with Christian blood, if he has any, as the only means of healing…

"On the third and principal reason, which is the faith of the Jews in the spiritual reality of Christian blood.

"The main reason which compels the Jews to kill Christians and collect their blood is the faith, secretly preserved especially by the hahams, or rabbis, that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary from Nazareth, who was condemned by our ancestors to death on the Cross, is, in all probability, the true Messiah who was for so long expected and invoked by the patriarchs and prophets. There are enough prophecies to convince them of this; especially important is the passage from Jeremiah: 'Be amazed, O heavens, tremble and be seized with horror, says the Lord, for two evils have My people committed: they have abandoned Me, the source of living water, and have cut out for themselves broken cisterns which cannot hold water' (Jeremiah 2.12,13).

"This prophecy is well-known and is understood in its true meaning by many rabbis, as it was very well known by Annas and Caiaphas. But, like them, from pride and hardness of heart, the rabbis do not want to recognise it, and therefore, resorting to pitiful interpretations, they have composed new rules – a real parody on the most important mysteries of the Church, so as to be saved by Christian blood, in which they see the blood of the Messiah Himself.

"In consequence of their conviction… the Jews use Christian blood at circumcision, which represents baptism; at marriage, which corresponds to this mystery among the Christians; in the unleavened bread of Pascha, which represents the Eucharist; at burials, imitating holy unction; in their lament over the destruction of Jerusalem, which represents the mystery of repentance. This is the basis of the secret, which I knew and sometimes applied with extraordinary zeal. I shall stop on each of these explanations.

"Marriage. When a marriage is concluded between Jews, the bride and bridegroom prepare for it with a strict fast for 24 hours, abstaining even from water until the setting of the sun. It is then that the rabbi appears. He takes a just-boiled egg, removes the shell and divides it in half. Then he sprinkles it, not with salt, but with a special ash, which I will say more about later. He gives half of this sprinkled egg to each spouse.

"Let us now say what this ash is. It is used not instead of salt, but instead of fresh Christian blood, being in actual fact changed Christian blood. It is precisely with the blood left over from the sacrifices carried out for the feast of unleavened bread, the more the better, that the rabbis infuse a corresponding quantity of flax or cotton thread, then they dry it and burn it. The ash is kept in bottles that are carefully sealed and given to the synagogue's treasurer. The latter distributes it gradually to the rabbis who ask for it, or for their own use, or for sending to those countries where it is impossible to obtain Christian blood, whether because there are no Christians there or because the police have been roused to be more watchful and the Christians more careful.

"In any case, fresh blood is always preferable, but it is necessary only for the unleavened bread, and in the case of insurmountable obstacles the indicated dark ash represents an acceptable substitute.

"Circumcision. A rabbi also appears for the circumcision of children on the eighth day after birth. He puts into a cup some of the best wine he can get hold of and pours one drop of Christian blood into it. It has been collected from torture, but if that is not available, some of the above-mentioned ash is used, into which a drop of the blood of the circumcised child is added. When this is well mixed with the wine, the rabbi immerses the finger of the child into the cup and says: 'I declare to you, child: your life is in your blood.' And he twice repeats this rite and these words.

"Here is a superstitious explanation which the rabbis give for this ceremony amongst themselves. The Prophet Ezekiel twice said: '"Live in your blood!" Thus I say to you: "Live in your blood!"' (Ezekiel 16.6). By these words the prophet perhaps wanted to indicate the blood of Jesus Christ, Who freed from bonds the souls of the holy fathers who did not receive a water baptism; and in such a case the souls of the Jews, although also themselves deprived of the water of baptism, will be saved by the blood of a Christian baptised in water. But one of the reasons why this blood must be collected amidst the cruel sufferings of the victim is precisely the necessity of representing thereby the Passion of Christ. On the contrary, if the Prophet Ezekiel wanted to speak only about every man's blood of circumcision, then the Jewish child will be saved by the power of the single drop of blood mixed by the rabbi in the wine with the Christian blood. What a pitiful nation!

"The anniversary of the taking of Jerusalem. The Jews again use the ash of which I have spoken on the ninth day of July, when they weep over the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. On this anniversary they use it in two ways: first, they wipe their forehead with it, which they thought would be unseemly to do with fresh blood, and secondly, they sprinkle an egg with it, and on that day every son of Israel without exception must eat a hard-boiled egg sprinkled with this ash…

"Death. A haham immediately goes to the house of him of whose death he just learned. He takes the white of an egg, mixes into it some Christian blood and a little ash and puts this mixture into the breast of the corpse, uttering the supposed words of Ezekiel: 'I shall sprinkle you with pure blood and you will be cleansed from all your filthiness' (Ezekiel 36.25). Ezekiel, it is true, said, not 'pure blood', but 'pure water'… But by dint of this corruption of the text the Jews convince themselves that the dead man will undoubtedly be admitted to paradise.

"The feasts of Pascha and Purim. These two feasts demand the same blood ritual.

"On paschal days the Jews must eat unleavened bread, small breads prepared only by hahams, into which Christian blood has been poured. Everyone, nobles and simple people, young and old, even those without teeth, must taste of this bread, even if it only a crumb the size of an olive…

"The feast of Purim was established in memory of the deliverance from the dominion of Haman by means of Esther and Mordecai, as this is recounted in the book of Esther. As is known, this feast comes in February. The initiated Jews are then occupied, wherever they can, with seizing as many Christians as possible, especially children. However, in this night they sacrifice only one, reproducing the torments of Haman. But for this reason, while the body is hanging, all those present cover it with thousands of insults, as if they were addressing Haman himself. The collected blood is poured out by the rabbi into flour that has already been dissolved with honey, from which he then makes small breads in the form of a triangle for the sake of ridiculing the mystery of the Holy Trinity. These breads are meant, not for the Jews, but through boundless cunning they are distributed to the most eminent families, which must give them away – and these gifts are considered the height of kindness – to their friends from among the Christians. This rite is called the Bread of Purim.

"We should note that this rite does not require the application of too heavy tortures to the victim precisely because the collected blood does not have any other purpose than the one I have indicated.

"The rest of kidnapped Christians, however, are kept in secret hiding-places until the day of Pascha, which comes shortly after Purim. At this time they are all offered in sacrifice in the cruellest and most barbaric manner, and they collect their blood partly for the unleavened bread and partly for other necessities which come up in the course of the year and have been indicated above. These torments at Pascha have a definite aim – to renew the sufferings of Christ, and for that reason they must be carried out mainly on children who through their innocence and virginity better symbolise the Saviour.

"In these depressing pourings out of blood the words of Jeremiah written in prophecy about the Jews are justified: 'Even on the hems of your clothes is found the blood of poor innocent people' (Jeremiah 2.34), and still better the words of Ezekiel: 'You eat with blood… and shed blood' (Ezekiel 33.25). In consequence of these innumerable murders Israel was expelled from various states, in particular from Spain, thereby justifying another prophecy of Ezekiel: 'Blood calls you to court' (Ezekiel 30.6)."[173]

Archbishop Anthony's attitude to Jewish blood rituals in general, and the Beilis trial in particular, was expressed in an interview he gave to A. Chizhevsky. After reminding his readers of how, at the request of Rabbi Skomorovsky, he had twice, in 1903 and 1905, spoken up against the

[173] Platonov, op. cit., pp. 748-754.

antisemite pogroms in Zhitomir, he went on: "But in both of the above-mentioned cases of my conversation with the rabbi, I decisively refused to say that I did not recognize the existence of ritual murders carried out by Jews, but on the contrary I expressed to my interlocutor my conviction that these murders exist, perhaps as belonging to one or another sect of the Jewish religion, perhaps as a secret of the highest spiritual government of the Jews, but there undoubtedly have been cases of ritual murders both in recent times and in antiquity.

"When my Jewish academic acquaintances pointed to the fact that Jewish law forbids the drinking of the blood even of animals, so that the thought of their mixing Christian blood with the paschal matsa was absurd, I replied that what seemed more probable to me was the link between the ritual killings and, not the Jewish feast of Pascha, but the feast that precedes it of 'Purim', in which the story of Esther, Haman and Mordecai is remembered, when the Persian king, having executed the enemy of the Jews, Haman, allowed them, who had not long before been condemned to general killing, to kill their enemies themselves. Purim in 1911 [the year of the ritual killing of Andrew Yuschinsky] took place on March 14 and 15, while the Jewish Pascha was from March 15-18…

"Already in deep antiquity the Jews were causing various disorders against various symbols hostile to them during this feast. Thus in 408 and 412 the Byzantine emperor issued two special decrees forbidding the Jews from celebrating Purim and mocking Christian crosses instead of Haman. I think that Christian children were also killed on this feast…"[174]

The Beilis trial polarized Russian society and, through the Jewish press, had international ramifications. Liberal opinion throughout the world pilloried Russia, which was now the country, supposedly, not only of the cruellest tyranny and retrograde religion, but also of systematic persecution and slander of the Jews. Unfortunately, these criticisms, though unjust, helped to create the very phenomenon they decried. Racial anti-semitism, as opposed to religious anti-Judaism and anti-Talmudism, had been rare in Russia – rarer than in most western countries. But in the decade that followed the Beilis trial, under the stress of war and revolution, real anti-semitism took root in Russia, with massacres far exceeding anything seen in the times of the tsars…

[174] Archbishop Anthony, in *Zhizn' Volynii* (The Life of Volhynia), □ 221, 2 September, 1913.

20. RASPUTIN

Kerensky said that "without Rasputin, there could have been no Lenin"… But no, Rasputin was not the cause of the Russian revolution: God would not have allowed the greatest Christian empire in history to fall because of the sinfulness of one man! Nevertheless, slanderous stories about the "elder's" supposed sexual relationship with the Empress, and of his control of the Russian government through her, undoubtedly had a corrosive influence on the reputation of the monarchy during the war and hastened its demise.

Since the early 1990s there have been attempts to rehabilitate the reputation of Rasputin, notably by the historians Oleg Platonov and Alexander Bakhanov.[175] We can sympathize with these attempts insofar as they are motivated by a desire to protect the reputation of the Tsar and Tsarina, which suffered so much because of their credulity in relation to Rasputin. Moreover, it is right to point out that many of those who attacked Rasputin in the dying days of the empire were motivated not so much by a desire to "save" the empire as by mercenary, egoistic and unpatriotic considerations that make their testimony highly dubious.

However, even after discounting these evilly-motivated testimonies, and taking into account the anti-monarchical bias of such "champions of the truth" about Rasputin as Guchkov and Rodzyanko, the evidence against Rasputin is too great and too varied to dismiss wholesale. In 1995 the historian and dramatist Edvard Radzinsky came into possession of the long-lost file of testimonies to the Extraordinary Commission set up by the Provisional Government in March, 1917 to investigate the truth or otherwise of accusations against the Royal Couple and those close to them.[176] These testimonies, which include some by close friends of Rasputin, such as his publisher Filippov, as well as by others whose integrity and devotion to the Royal Couple cannot be doubted, and by several of his female victims, force us to the conclusion that, barring some of the wildest accusations, Rasputin was "guilty as charged". Also impossible to reject wholesale are the very extensive police reports on Rasputin's immoral behaviour. While Bakhanov among others has tried to dismiss even this evidence, Alexander Khitrov is right in pointing out that the police were, after the Tsar himself, the very first victims of the February revolution, and so cannot be accused of simply making up the whole story.[177]

As the revolutionary threat receded (temporarily) after 1905, a new, more subtle and sinister threat appeared: theosophy, occultism, spiritism and

---

[175] Bakhmatov, *Pravda o Grigorii Rasputine* (The Truth about Gregory Rasputin), Moscow, 2010.

[176] Radzinsky, *Rasputin: The Last Word*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2000.

[177] Khitrov, "Rasputin-Novykh Grigory Efimovich i kratkaia istoria spornogo voprosa o priznanii v RPTsZ ego oschetserkovnogo pochitania, kak pravoslavnogo startsa" (Gregory Efimovich Rasputin-Novykh and a short history of the controversial question of his recognition in ROCOR of his veneration throughout the Church as an Orthodox elder).

pornography flooded into Russia.[178] Also sharply on the rise, especially among the peasantry, were Protestant sects, as well as sectarian movements that hid among the Orthodox peasantry like the khlysty. The Siberian peasant Gregory Rasputin was symbolic of this trend, which undermined the foundations of Holy Rus' just as surely as the anti-monarchism of the revolutionaries.

After a debauched youth, Rasputin repented and spent some years on pilgrimage, going from monastery to monastery. He then married and had children, but was recommended by a churchman to his colleagues in St. Petersburg. "Rasputin first appeared in St. Petersburg most probably in 1902, having by that time 'won the heart' of the Kazan bishop Chrisanthus, who recommended him to the rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, Bishop Sergius [Stragorodsky, the future patriarch]. The latter, in his turn, presented Rasputin to the professor, celibate priest Veniamin, and to the inspector of the Academy, Archimandrite Theophan." [179]

In November, 1905, Rasputin met the Tsar for the first time (probably through the mediation of the Montenegrin Grand Duchesses Militsa and Anastasia). The Royal Couple, and especially the Tsarina, had already shown their vulnerability to religious quacks in the affair of the French charlatan, "Monsieur Philippe" of Lyons. At that time Grand Duchess Elizabeth, the Tsarina's sister had tried to open her eyes to the deception, but without success – she attributed her failure to her sister's inability to distinguish between the true faith and the condition of religious exaltation.[180] St. Elizabeth would also become a strong opponent of her sister's "second Friend", Rasputin. But the second Friend had a powerful weapon that the first Friend did not have – his extraordinary ability to heal the symptoms of the Tsarevich Alexei's haemophilia, a closely guarded secret in the Royal Family and a cause of great anguish to his parents. As Pierre Gilliard, the Tsarevich's tutor, said: "The illness of the Tsarevich cast a shadow over the whole of the concluding period of Tsar Nicholas II's reign, and… was one of the main causes of his fall, for it made possible the phenomenon of Rasputin and resulted in the fatal seduction of the sovereigns who lived in a world apart, wholly absorbed in a tragic anxiety which to be concealed from the eyes of all."

General V.N. Voeikov, commandant of the palace at Tsarskoye Selo and a close friend of the Royal Couple until the end, was sceptical about Rasputin from the beginning. But he witnessed to his healing power: "From the first time Rasputin appeared at the bed of the sick heir, alleviation followed immediately. All those close to the Royal Family were well acquainted with

---

[178] Maria Carlson, *"No Religion Higher than Truth": A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875-1922,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

[179] Alexander Bokhanov, Manfred Knodt, Vladimir Oustimenko, Zinaida Peregudova, Lyubov Tyutyunnik, *The Romanovs*, London: Leppi, 1993, p. 233.

[180] *Velikaia Kniaginia Elizaveta Fyodorovna i Imperator Nikolai I* (Great Princess Elizabeth Fyodorovna and Emperor Nicholas I), St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2009, p. 34.

the case in Spala, when the doctors found no means of helping Alexis Nikolayevich, who was suffering terribly and groaning from pain. As soon as a telegram was sent to Rasputin on the advice of Vyrubova, and the reply was received, the pains began to decrease, his temperature began to fall, and soon the heir got better.

"If we take the point of view of the Empress-mother, who saw in Rasputin a God-fearing elder who had helped her sick son by his prayers – much should be understood and forgiven by every Russian devoted to the throne and the Homeland.

"The help he gave to the heir strengthened the position of Rasputin to such a degree at court that he no longer had need of the support of the [Montenegrin] Great Princesses and clergy. As a completely uneducated man, he was not able or did not want to hide this, and simply turned his back on his benefactors. Then there began denunciations against him; in the Synod they began a case to investigate the life and activity of Rasputin with the aim of demonstrating that he was a sectarian preaching principles harmful to Orthodoxy; while in society they began to speak about him as about a debauchee who cast a shadow on the empress by his appearances at court. The excuse for these conversations was disillusionment in Rasputin, who did not justify the hopes laid upon him.

"The stronger the campaign of denunciation against the Rasputin coming from the Duma, the more there developed in her Majesty the feeling that it was necessary to protect the man who was irreplaceable for the health of the heir: the influence of the empress on certain appointments can be explained by her desire to distance people who were dangerous to Rasputin from power.

"Taking full account of all this, Rasputin put on the mask of a righteous man at court, but outside it did not disdain to use the privileges of his position and to satisfy his sometimes wild instincts..."[181]

Of particular significance was the relationship between Rasputin and Archimandrite, later Bishop Theophan.[182]

Vladyka was at first impressed by the peasant, but became disillusioned with him after becoming convinced, from his own observations and from the

---

[181] Voeikov, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[182] On this important, but unsung hero of the faith, see Monk Anthony (Chernov), *Vie de Monseigneur Théophane, Archevêque de Poltava et de Pereiaslavl (The Life of his Eminence Theophan, Archbishop of Poltava and Pereyaslavl)*, Lavardac: Monastère Orthodoxe St. Michel, 1988; Richard Bettes, Vyacheslav Marchenko, *Dukhovnik Tsarskoj Sem'i (Spiritual Father of the Royal Family)*, Moscow: Valaam Society of America, 1994, pp. 60-61; Archbishop Averky (Taushev), *Vysokopreosviaschennij Feofan, Arkhiepiskop Poltavskij i Pereiaslavskij (His Eminence Theophan, Archbishop of Poltava and Pereyaslavl)*, Jordanville: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1974 ; Radzinsky, *Rasputin*, op. cit.

confessions of his spiritual daughters, that the man was untrustworthy and sexually rapacious.

"After a while," he testified to the Extraordinary Commission, "rumours reached me that Rasputin had resumed his former way of life and was undertaking something against us… I decided to resort to a final measure – to denounce him openly and to communicate everything to the former emperor. It was not, however, the emperor who received me but his wife in the presence of the maid of honour Vyrubova.

"I spoke for about an hour and demonstrated that Rasputin was in a state of spiritual deception… The former empress grew agitated and objected, citing theological works… I destroyed all her arguments, but she… reiterated them: 'It is all falsehood and slander'… I concluded the conversation by saying that I could no longer have anything to do with Rasputin… I think Rasputin, as a cunning person, explained to the royal family that my speaking against him was because I envied his closeness to the Family… that I wanted to push him out of the way.

"After my conversation with the empress, Rasputin came to see me as if nothing had happened, having apparently decided that the empress's displeasure had intimidated me… However, I told him in no uncertain terms, 'Go away, you are a fraud.' Rasputin fell on his knees before me and asked my forgiveness… But again I told him, 'Go away, you have violated a promise given before God.' Rasputin left, and I did not see him again."

At this point Vladyka received a "Confession" from a former devotee of Rasputin's. On reading this, he understood that Rasputin was "a wolf in sheep's clothing" and "a sectarian of the khlyst type" who "taught his followers not to reveal his secrets even to their confessors. For if there is allegedly no sin in what these sectarians do, then their confessors need not be made aware of it."

"Availing myself of that written confession, I wrote the former emperor a second letter… in which I declared that Rasputin not only was in a state of spiritual deception but was also a criminal in the religious and moral sense… In the moral sense because, as it followed from the 'confession', Father Gregory had seduced his victims."

There was no reply to this letter. "I sensed that they did not want to hear me out and understand… It all depressed me so much that I became quite ill." But in fact, Vladyka's letter had reached the Tsar, and the scandal surrounding the rape of the children's nurse, Vishnyakova, whose confessor was Vladyka, could no longer be concealed. Vishnyakova herself testified to the Extraordinary Commission that she had been raped by Rasputin during a visit to Verkhoturye Monastery in Tobolsk province, a journey undertaken at the empress's suggestion. "Upon our return to Petrograd, I reported everything to the empress, and I also told Bishop Theophan in a private

meeting with him. The empress did not give any heed to my words and said that everything Rasputin does is holy. From that time forth I did not see Rasputin, and in 1913 I was dismissed from my duties as nurse. I was also reprimanded for frequenting the Right Reverend Theophan."

Another person in on the secret was the maid of honour Sophia Tyutcheva, grand-daughter of the famous poet. As she witnessed to the Commission, she was summoned to the Tsar.

"You have guessed why I summoned you. What is going on in the nursery?"

She told him.

"So you too do not believe in Rasputin's holiness?"

She replied that she did not.

"But what will you say if I tell you that I have lived all these years only thanks to his prayers?"

Then he "began saying that he did not believe any of the stories, that the impure always sticks to the pure, and that he did not understand what had suddenly happened to Theophan, who had always been so fond of Rasputin. During this time he pointed to a letter from Theophan on his desk."

"'You, your majesty, are too pure of heart and do not see what filth surrounds you.' I said that it filled me with fear that such a person could be near the grand duchesses.

"'Am I then the enemy of my own children?' the sovereign objected.

"He asked me never to mention Rasputin's name in conversation. In order for that to take place, I asked the sovereign to arrange things so that Rasputin would never appear in the children's wing."

But her wish was not granted, and both Vishnyakova and Tyutcheva would not long remain in the tsar's service…

It was at about this time that the newspapers began to write against Rasputin. And a member of the circle of the Grand Duchess Elizabeth Fyodorovna, Michael Alexandrovich Novoselov, the future bishop-martyr of the Catacomb Church, published a series of articles condemning Rasputin. "Why do the bishops," he wrote, "who are well acquainted with the activities of this blatant deceiver and corrupter, keep silent?… Where is their grace, if through laziness or lack of courage they do not keep watch over the purity of the faith of the Church of God and allow the lascivious khlyst to do the works of darkness under the mask of light?" The brochure was forbidden and

confiscated while it was still at the printer's, and the newspaper *The Voice of Moscow* was heavily fined for publishing excerpts from it.

Also disturbed by the rumours about Rasputin was the Prime Minister Peter Arkadievich Stolypin. But he had to confess, as his daughter Maria relates: "Nothing can be done. Every time the opportunity presents itself I warn his Majesty. But this is what he replied to me recently: 'I agree with you, Peter Arkadievich, but better ten Rasputins than one hysterical empress.' Of course, the whole matter is in that. The empress is ill, seriously ill; she believes that Rasputin is the only person in the whole world who can help the heir, and it is beyond human strength to persuade her otherwise. You know how difficult in general it is to talk to her. If she is taken with some idea, then she no longer takes account of whether it is realisable or not… Her intentions are the very best, but she is really ill…"

In November, 1910, Bishop Theophan went to the Crimea to recover from his illness. But he did not give up, and inundated his friend Bishop Hermogen of Saratov, the future hieromartyr, with letters. It was his aim to enlist this courageous fighter against freethinking in his fight against Rasputin. But this was difficult because it had been none other than Vladyka Theophan who had at some time introduced Rasputin to Bishop Hermogen, speaking of him, as Bishop Hermogen himself said, "in the most laudatory terms." Indeed, for a time Bishop Hermogen and Rasputin had become allies in the struggle against freethinking and modernism.

Unfortunately, a far less reliable person then joined himself to Rasputin's circle – Sergius Trophanov, in monasticism Iliodor, one of Bishop Theophan's students at the academy, who later became a co-worker of Dzerzhinsky, a Baptist, married and had seven children. In an interview with the newspaper *Rech'* (January 9, 1913) Fr. Iliodor said: "I used to be a magician and fooled the people. I was a Deist." He built a large church in Tsaritsyn on the Volga, and began to draw thousands to it with his fiery sermons against the Jews and the intellectuals and the capitalists. He invited Rasputin to join him in Tsaritsyn and become the elder of a convent there. Rasputin agreed.

However, Iliodor's inflammatory sermons were not pleasing to the authorities, and in January, 1911 he was transferred to a monastery in Tula diocese. But he refused to go, locked himself in his church in Tsaritsyn and declared a hunger-strike. Bishop Hermogen supported him, but the tsar did not, and ordered him to be removed from Tsaritsyn.

When Rasputin's bad actions began to come to light, Hermogen vacillated for a long time. However, having made up his mind that Vladyka Theophan was right, and having Iliodor on his side now too, he decided to bring the matter up before the Holy Synod, of which he was a member, at its next session. Before that, however, he determined to denounce Rasputin to his face.

This took place on December 16, 1911. According to Iliodor's account, Hermogen, clothed in hierarchical vestments and holding a cross in his hand, "took hold of the head of the 'elder' with his left hand, and with his right started beating him on the head with the cross and shouting in a terrifying voice, 'Devil! I forbid you in God's name to touch the female sex. Brigand! I forbid you to enter the royal household and to have anything to do with the tsarina! As a mother brings forth the child in the cradle, so the holy Church through its prayers, blessings, and heroic feats has nursed that great and sacred thing of the people, the autocratic rule of the tsars. And now you, scum, are destroying it, you are smashing our holy vessels, the bearers of autocratic power… Fear God, fear His life-giving cross!"

Then they forced Rasputin to swear that he would leave the palace. According to one version of events, Rasputin swore, but immediately told the empress what had happened. According to another, he refused, after which Vladyka Hermogen cursed him. In any case, on the same day, December 16, five years later, he was killed…

Then Bishop Hermogen went to the Holy Synod. First he gave a speech against the khlysty. Then he charged Rasputin with khlyst tendencies. Unfortunately, only a minority of the bishops supported the courageous bishop. The majority followed the over-procurator in expressing dissatisfaction with his interference "in things that were not of his concern".

Vladyka Hermogen was then ordered to return to his diocese. As the director of the chancery of the over-procurator witnessed, "he did not obey the order and, as I heard, asked by telegram for an audience with the tsar, indicating that he had an important matter to discuss, but was turned down." On receiving this rejection, Bishop Hermogen began to weep. Then he said: "They will kill the tsar, they will kill the tsar, they will surely kill him."

The opponents of Rasputin now felt the fury of the Tsar. Bishop Hermogen and Iliodor were exiled to remote monasteries (Iliodor took his revenge by leaking forged letters of the Empress to Rasputin). And Vladyka Theophan was transferred to the see of Astrakhan. The Tsar ordered the secular press to stop printing stories about Rasputin. Before leaving the Crimea, Vladyka called on Rasputin's friend, the deputy over-procurator Damansky. He told him: "Rasputin is a vessel of the devil, and the time will come when the Lord will chastise him and those who protect him."

Later, in October, 1913, Rasputin tried to take his revenge on Bishop Theophan by bribing the widow of a Yalta priest who knew him to say that Vladyka had said that he had had relations with the empress. The righteous widow rejected his money and even spat in his face…

During the war, the influence of Rasputin became more dangerous. For, with the Tsar at the front, control of home appointments de facto came under the control of the Tsarina, who always turned to Rasputin and to those who

were approved by him... Voeikov points out that from 1914 Vyrubova and Rasputin "began to take a greater and greater interest in questions of internal politics", but at the same time argues that the number of appointments actually made by the Tsarina were few.[183] But they included Prime Ministers, Interior Ministers and church metropolitans. It is hardly surprising, in those circumstances, that the reputation of the Royal Couple suffered...

Who, in the end, was Rasputin? Bishop Theophan's opinion was that Rasputin had originally been a sincerely religious man with real gifts, but that he had been corrupted by his contacts with aristocratic society. Archbishop Anthony (Khraptovitsky) of Voronezh had a similar opinion. After having tea with him twice, Rasputin "revealed himself as a deceiver and intriguer". But the Royal Couple, "surrounded as they were from all sides by flattery and slanders, decided that love for truth and honourableness remained only in the simple people, and therefore turned to 'the people's reason'…

"However, they forgot about the most important point in such a choice.

"I myself was raised in the countryside amidst middle-ranking landowners and close to the people, and I share all the positive declarations about the people's reason and the people's honourableness. But I insist on my conviction that a peasant is worthy of every respect as long as he remains a peasant. But if he enters the milieu of the masters, he will unfailingly be corrupted..."[184]

Rasputin was killed on December 16, 1916 at the hands of Great Prince Dmitri Pavlovich Romanov, Prince Felix Yusupov and a right-wing member of the Duma, Purishkevich. Yusupov lured him to his flat on the pretext of introducing him to his wife, the beautiful Irina, the Tsar's niece. He was given madeira mixed with poison (although this is disputed), but this did not kill him. He was shot twice, but neither did this kill him. Finally he was shot a third time and pushed under the ice of the River Neva.[185]

The Tsar refused to condone the killing, which he called murder. But Yusupov was justified by his close friend, Great Princess Elizabeth Fyodorovna, who said that he only done his patriotic duty – "you killed a demon," she said. Then, as Yusopov himself writes in his *Memoirs*, "she informed me that several days after the death of Rasputin the abbesses of monasteries came to her to tell her about what had happened with them on

---

[183] Voeikov, op. cit., pp. 50, 143.

[184] Khrapovitsky, "Moi Vospominania" (My Reminiscences), *Tserkovnie Vedomosti,* N 450, in Bishop Nikon (Rklitsky), *Zhizneopisanie Blazhennejshago Antonia* (Biography of his Beatitude Anthony), vol. 3, New York, 1957, pp. 8-11.

[185] A joint investigation by British and Russian police has now come to the conclusion that the third and fatal shot that killed Rasputin was actually fired by a British secret service agent. See Michael Smith, *A History of Britain's Secret Intelligence Service,* London: Dialogue; Annabel Venning, "How Britain's First Spy Chief Ordered Rasputin's Murder", *Daily Mail,* July 22, 2010, pp. 32-33.

the night of the 30th. During the all-night vigil priests had been seized by an attack of madness, had blasphemed and shouted out in a voice that was not their own. Nuns had run down the corridors crying like hysterics and tearing their dresses with indecent movements of the body…"[186]

Rasputin was a symbol of the majority, peasant stratum of the Russian population in the last days of the empire. Though basically Orthodox and monarchist, it was infected with spiritual diseases that manifested themselves in the wild behaviour of so many peasants and workers after the revolution. The support of the peasants kept the monarchy alive just as Rasputin kept the tsarevich alive, stopping the flow of blood that represented the ebbing spiritual strength of the dynasty. "Rasputin," writes Radzinsky, "is a key to understanding both the soul and the brutality of the Russia that came after him. He was a precursor of the millions of peasants who, with religious consciousness in their souls, would nevertheless tear down churches, and who, with a dream of the reign of Love and Justice, would murder, rape, and flood the country with blood, in the end destroying themselves..."[187]

But while Rasputin and the majority of Russians descended into madness, it was a different story for the royal family that had put their trust in them. For they became holy martyrs... Thus "the child, "who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron… was caught up to God and His throne" (Revelation 12.5)...

[186] Yusupov, *Memuary* (Memoirs), Moscow, 1998, p. 230.
[187] Radzinsky, *Rasputin,* p. 501.

21. THE BALKAN WARS

In 1908 two new ingredients were cast into Balkan cauldron that started the pot boiling again: Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia, which angered the Serbs and the Russians, but which they were unable to do anything about, and the Masonic revolution in Turkey by the "Committee of Union and Progress" (CUP), otherwise known as "the Young Turks".

"The Young Turks," writes Dominic Lieven, "were the products of the Western-style schools and colleges created by the Ottoman regime from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The movement's core often consisted of army officers but included many civilian professionals as well. They had many similarities with Russian revolutionaries of their time and with later Third World radicalism. Their great enemy was their country's backwardness, which they blamed on the Ottoman regime and, usually, on religion, which they saw as the main cause of the people's ignorance, sloth and conservatism. Their own creed was a rather crude belief in science and materialism, combined with a linguistic and ethnic Turkish nationalism based on European models. They were populists but also great Jacobin elitists, convinced that it was the new Westernized elite's duty to lead the nation to prosperity and power. They were seldom themselves of traditional upper-class origin, and their radicalism owed much to the sense that their own professional merit went unnoticed by a regime whose rulers promoted clients on the basis of personal connection and political loyalty."[188]

"In 1906," writes Misha Glenny, "small conspiracies arose inside the Empire. Cells loyal to the subversive project began to form inside the army in Salonika and Damascus. These then multiplied, escaping the body of the armed forces to infect parts of the Ottoman administration – officials in the post and telegraph office, in the schools and in the judicial system. In Salonika, many Jews, and a few Armenians, Greeks and Bulgarians were also recruited into this embryonic resistance. The organization in Damascus, *Vatan* (Fatherland), was not remotely as influential as its counterpart in Salonika. But it is worth nothing that one of the co-founders of the Damascus conspiracy was Mustafa Kemal, a young, strong-minded officer from Salonika."[189]

---

[188] Lieven, op. cit., p. 134.

[189] Glenny, op. cit., p. 212. The aim of Ataturk's *Fatherland* Society, which was later merged with the CUP, was, as he told his friends, nothing less than to liberate the Homeland from tyranny and enable the Turks to rule themselves: "Today, they wish to separate the Rumelia region in Macedonia from the homeland. Foreigners are now exercising their partial and actual influence and control over parts of the country, The Padishah [Sultan] is capable of committing all evils, who thinks of nothing but his pleasures and the sultanate. The people are being crushed under tyranny and oppression. There is death and collapse in a country in which there is no freedom. The reason for all advancement and formation is liberty. Today history is burdening us, her sons, with some major tasks. I have established a society in Syria. We have started the struggle against tyranny and oppression. I came to set up the foundations of this society here as well. It is imperative to work in secrecy and awaken the organization. I expect self-sacrifice from all of you. I invite you to the task of rebelling against

The CUP's stronghold was the Army in Macedonia, which had learned much from the discipline and conspiratorial techniques of the Bulgarian and Macedonian guerrillas. In fact, some of the rebel soldiers in Macedonia formed pacts with the Albanians, and with the Bulgarian and Serbian guerrillas they were supposed to be fighting.[190] The result was a stunning victory for the revolution: the Sultan was deposed in 1909, and by 1913 the CUP was in complete control of the empire.

The Young Turks at first renounced nationalism so as to bring as many members of other nationalities of the multi-national empire onto its side. And so in Constantinople Muslims joined with Armenians in requiem services for the massacres of 1896. Again, on July 23, 1908, "Salonika's gendarmerie commander observed how '[o]n the balcony of the Konak [town hall], Greek and Bulgarian bishops and the mufti shook hands and then in the name of fraternity, they invited their co-religionists to follow suit… A cry of joy burst from every lung in the crowd and you could see Muslims, Greeks and Bulgarians, the old mortal enemies, falling into one another's arms. An indescribable delirium ensued as the reconciliation of the races and religions was consecrated underneath an immense flag emblazoned with the words 'Long Live the Constitution'…"[191]

It was indeed an extraordinary moment, comparable only to the frenzied joy that accompanied the overthrow of the Tsar only nine years later in Petrograd. Like Herod and Pilate, bitter rivals abandoned their enmity in joy at the overthrow of their common enemy – one-man-rule that recognized its authority as coming, not from men, but from the One God. Instead a new god, "the Constitution", was erected and worshipped by all. Meanwhile, the priests of the new religion, the Masons, took over the reins of government – men such as Mehment Talaat Pasha, Grand Master of the Turkish Grand Orient, and Kemal Ataturk, who had been initiated into an Italian lodge in Macedonia. On July 23, 1908, the same day as the celebrations in Salonika, they restored the Midhat constitution to the empire…

However, it was not long before the new government cast off its liberal and cosmopolitan mask. "Over three years of counterrevolution and restoration, revolutionary idealism turned into a regime whose brutality surpassed that of Abdulhamid. 'The old espionage had returned, the extortion had never ceased, the oppression against non-Moslems had now acquired a fresher and more sinister vigour, for the measure of freedom that each nationality had once enjoyed was now being ruthlessly crushed by a heretofore unknown chauvinism.'"[192]

---

this damned oppression, tearing down this rotten, worn-out administration, so that the people can rule themselves – in short, to save the motherland." (Ilhan Akit, *Mustafa Kemal Ataturk,* Istanbul, 1998, pp. 22-23)

[190] Glenny, op, cit., p. 215.

[191] Glenny, op. cit., p. 216.

[192] Glenny, op. cit., p. 218.

As for the goodwill that the Young Turks offered to the Orthodox Christians, this "had been offered subject to extremely onerous conditions. While the Young Turk revolution had temporarily spread the gospel of harmony among the Empire's constituent peoples, it had had no such effect on Macedonia's neighbours in the Balkans – Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia. On the contrary, they saw the success of the revolution as a sign of the Empire's extreme weakness and it galvanized their expansionist ambitions.

"The most immediate blow to the movement for reconciliation in the Ottoman Empire was delivered by Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary and Greece. In October, Prince Ferdinand exploited the political chaos in the Ottoman Empire by declaring Bulgaria fully independent – until then it had been nominally under the suzerainty of the Empire. Within days, Austria-Hungary followed suit by announcing the full annexation of the occupied territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina and before long Greece proclaimed *enosis* with Crete. These events, in particular Vienna's annexation of Bosnia, set alarm bells ringing in the Ottoman military barracks, the real power behind the CUP. Henceforth, any Christian demands which smacked of secessionism would be rejected. In response, the guerrillas in Macedonia – Serb, Bulgarian, Greek and, significantly, Albanian – took to the hills once more. The military establishments of Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire had taken their first steps along the road that ended with the First and Second Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913."[193]

Tsar Nicholas II knew better than any Balkan Christian the true significance of the events of 1908, and the great danger they posed for the whole of Orthodoxy. Basically, the whole vast region of the Ottoman Empire had fallen under the power of Orthodoxy's greatest enemy, the revolution. And the Serbs, Bulgarians and Greeks, in spite of their recent rejoicing *with* the Turks over their revolution, were now gripped by a mad enthusiasm for war *against* Turkey that might well trigger a far wider war between the great powers.

All three states were rapidly rearming themselves. As a result, all were deeply in debt to western arms manufacturers (the Serbs to French ones, the Bulgarians to German ones). And, in spite of their rivalries over Macedonia, all were more ready to enter into commercial agreements with each other than turn for help to any great power, including Russia. But they failed to realize – or did not want to take into account – the fact that any war with Turkey would inevitably draw Austria into the conflict in some way or other, since Austria now owned Bosnia - which had to pose a threat at any rate to Serbia's expansionist plans. Moreover, in alliance with Austria was a new and very powerful enemy – Germany, which had been making significant inroads into the Ottoman Empire through its railway projects, and which was reorganizing the Ottoman Army under the leadership of German generals.

[193] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 218-219.

In 1894, in order to counter the increasing economic and military power of the German empire, and the threat posed to the Balkan Slavs by the German-Austrian alliance, Russia had formed an alliance with France; and in 1907 these Russia and France were joined by Britain – a remarkable turn-round in view of Britain's long-standing hostility to Russia.

"The division of Europe into two military alliances," writes Dominic Lieven, "made it almost certain that any conflict between great powers [for example, over the Balkans] would engulf the entire continent. Nevertheless, in the first decade of Nicholas's reign Russia's relations with Berlin and Vienna were friendly. This was in part because much of Petersburg's attention was devoted to the Far East, which in turn made it easier to agree with Austria on a policy of supporting the status quo in the Balkans.

"Russia's defeat by Japan in 1904-05 and the subsequent Russian revolution of 1905-06 changed matters very much for the worse. Awareness of Russian impotence encouraged first Germany and then Austria to defend their interests in the Moroccan Crisis of 1905-06 and in the 1908-09 Bosnian crisis [when Austria annexed Bosnia and Russia was powerless to do anything about it] in a more aggressive manner than would otherwise have been the case…"[194]

The situation was made more difficult for the Tsar by the rise, within Russia, of a powerful coalition of liberals and nationalists who wanted a more aggressive policy in the Balkans. "Between 1907 and 1914 the outlines of a coalition between sections of Russia's economic, political and intellectual élites based on a combination of liberal and nationalist ideas began to emerge. It encompassed a number of leading Moscow industrialists, some of Russia's greatest liberal intellectuals and many Duma leaders. By 1914 this shadowy coalition had important friends in both the army and the bureaucracy. Prince Grigori Trubetskoy, who ran the Foreign Ministry's department of Near Eastern and Balkan affairs, was closely linked to the Moscow industrialists and to Peter Struve, the leading intellectual spokesman for the coalition of the liberal-conservative and nationalist elites. Even Alexander Krivoshein, the Minister of Agriculture, was a potential ally of this coalition. His ministry, and indeed he himself, maintained cordial relations with the Duma and the zemstva. On the whole, they enjoyed a good press. And Krivoshein was not merely inclined towards pro-Slav nationalist sympathies, he had also married a daughter of one of Moscow's leading industrialist families. It needs to be stressed that this coalition was still in embryo in 1907-9 and that Germany's own aggressive policies played a role in bringing it to life in later years. Nevertheless the Germans were not wrong to watch Russian domestic developments with great concern in the pre-war era. The idea that the liberal-

[194] Lieven, "Russia, Europe and World War I", in Edward Acton, Vladimir Cherniaev, William Rosenberg (eds.), *A Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution, 1914-1921*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997, pp. 41-42.

nationalist, anti-German and pro-Slav coalition represented the wave of the future was not unreasonable and was widely believed both in Russia and abroad…"[195]

But the Tsar had to resist the liberal-nationalist wave; for he knew that Russia was not ready for war – in fact, foreign war might well trigger internal revolution. For that reason he wanted to restrain the hotheads in the Balkans. But the problem was: the Balkan hotheads did not see it that way. As one Bulgarian statesman, interviewed by the journalist Leon Trotsky, said soon after the First Balkan War: "We must, of course, say this all politeness, to all the other diplomats from Europe, as they labour in the sweat of their brows for our happiness. 'Neither honey nor thorns,' dear sirs! We ourselves will settle with Turkey, without any interference from Europe, and all the more firmly and satisfactorily. Europe puts on an air of being afraid that we shall be excessively demanding. And this from Europe – that is to say, from Austria-Hungary, who annexed Bosnia; from Italy, who seized Tripolitania; from Russia, who never takes her eyes off Constantinople… This is the Europe that comes to us preaching moderation and restraint. Truly, a sight for the gods on Olympus!... Your diplomats are sulking. They would not be averse to freezing the Balkans for another ten years, in expectation of better days sometime. How is it that they cannot understand that less and less is it possible in our epoch to direct the destinies of the Balkans from the outside? We are growing up, gaining confidence, and becoming independent… In the very first years of our present phase of existence as a state, we told our would-be guardians: 'Bulgaria will follow her own line.'… And so Messrs. Privy Councillors of all the diplomatic chanceries would do well to get used to the idea that the Balkan Peninsula 'will follow its own line'…"[196]

One result of the Young Turk revolution was the stirring of unrest in Albania: as the Balkan Orthodox became increasingly independent, the Albanians also sought autonomy. But the new regime in Constantinople refused them this. So it was logical to expect that they would side with the Greeks, Bulgarians and Serbs who were rapidly rearming in order to overthrow the Turkish yoke once and for all. However, the Balkan Orthodox had claims on Albanian-occupied lands: Scutari in the north (Montenegro), Kosovo in the east (Serbia) and "Northern Epirus" in the south (Greece). So they planned to unite amongst themselves and rise up in war against the Ottomans and Albanians.

The First Balkan War broke out when Montenegro invaded Northern Albania in October, 1912.

The war was opposed by Orthodox Russia. Edvard Radzinsky writes: "The tsar understood how that impudent disruption of the status quo in the Balkans would ignite an explosion of indignation among the great powers.

[195] Lieven, *Nicholas II*, London: Pimlico, 1993, pp. 191-192
[196] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 225-226.

The minister of foreign affairs was instructed to persuade Montenegro to end its occupation of the fortress [of Shkodra or Scutari]. But [King Nikolai] knew of the bellicose mood in Petersburg and of the support of Grand Duke Nikolai, the 'dread uncle', and he callously continued the siege of Scutari.

"[In October, 1912 Montenegro declared war on Turkey and invaded Northern Albania. And then**]** on 5 (18 NS) October Serbia and Bulgaria entered the war against Turkey, followed by Greece the day after. And the Turkish army sustained defeat after defeat. News of the successes of the Balkan alliance – of their brothers in the faith – against the Turkish Moslems gave rise to an outpouring of joyous nationalism in Russia. There were continual demonstrations in Petersburg bearing the slogan, 'A Cross of Holy Sophia'… Everyone was again caught up in the old dream of the Russian tsars: of taking Constantinople back by force from Turkey – Constantinople, the ancient capital of Byzantium, from which Rus had adopted its Christian faith.

"The response was immediate. The Austrians and Germans threatened war.

"And again the Balkan boiler was about to blow up the whole world.

"On 10 and 29 November and on 5 December 1912, the Council of Ministers met in Petersburg. And the situation of a few years before was repeated. Russian society wanted to fight: the demands for military assistance to its 'Balkan brothers' were unanimous, and the registering of volunteers began. Even Rasputin's friend Filippov was for war at the time. And there was no Stolypin powerful enough to overcome public opinion (or, more accurately, public insanity). War was again at the very threshold. And once again it would be a world war. The Austrian fleet and the ships of the great powers had already blockaded the Montenegrin coast. General mobilization was anticipated in Russia. Speaker of the State Duma Rodzyanko counselled the tsar to fight.

"And then the tsar suddenly demonstrated character: he resolutely moved against public opinion. He demanded that the minister of foreign affairs put pressure on Montenegro. And on 21 April 1913 the Montenegrin king, after many hours of persuasion, consented to withdraw from Scutari in return for monetary indemnification. And the Russian foreign minister, Sergius Sazonov, announced with relief, 'King Nikola was going to set the world on fire to cook his own little omelette.' This was in reply to the constant reproaches that Russia had once again betrayed its Balkan brothers."[197]

Radzinsky attributes the tsar's sudden firmness to the fact that Rasputin and the Empress were against the war. "And the tsar was forced to submit." But this is to ignore the fact that the tsar had already shown similar firmness

[197] Radzinsky, *The Last Tsar*, pp. 188-189.

during the Bosnian annexation crisis of 1908, and that his behaviour was perfectly consistent with his beliefs – that it was not in Russia's interests to go to war to defend the territorial ambitions of the Balkan Slavs. Only in 1914 would he be forced to submit to the call for war. But the situation then, as we shall see, was different: Russia was not called to help the Serbs in some madcap aggression, but to *defend* them from annihilation in a just war…

The First Balkan War ended in victory and substantial territorial gains for the Balkan Orthodox, leaving the Turks control of only a small corner of Europe close to Constantinople. As for the other losers, the Albanians, on December 20, 1912 the Great Powers, under Austrian pressure, agreed to create an independent principality of Albania. The Russians accepted only reluctantly, and secured most of Kosovo and its mixed Serb and Albanian population for Serbia. From January to March, 1915 the government of Albania was entrusted to an International Commission of Control. They appointed the German Prince Wilhelm of Wied as ruler. But an uprising by the Muslims of Central Albania drove him out in September…[198]

But the Bulgarian King Ferdinand was unhappy with the distribution of the spoils of victory, especially in Macedonia, and attacked Greece and Serbia. This led to the outbreak of the Second Balkan War in 1913, which ended with the victory of Greece, Serbia, Romania and Turkey over Bulgaria. In ten weeks' fighting during the two wars about 200,000 soldiers were killed. The money that Bulgaria and Serbia had been pouring into their armed forces since the 1880s finally paid off in a series of brilliant victories using all the means of modern technology – and the western powers were impressed.

---

[198] Meanwhile, on May 4, 1914 there took place, as N.Yu. Selischev writes, "the signing of the document widely known in Greece as 'the Corfu protocol'. The Corfu protocol gave the Orthodox Greeks a broad autonomy and sealed their religious, civil and social rights. The international control commission of the great powers (Russia was represented by the consul-general M. Petriaev) acted as a mediator in the quarrel and became the trustee of the fulfilment of the Corfu accord. In Russia the Corfu protocol… was known as the 'Epirot-Albanian accord'. That is, the question of Epirus was not reduced to the level of an 'internal affair' of the newly created Albania, but was raised to the significance of an international agreement when the Orthodox Greek Epirots and the Mohammedan Albanians were recognized as parties to the agreement having equal rights. Our [Russian] press at that time – *Pravitel'stvennij Vestnik, Sankt-Peterburgskia Vedomosti* and the conservative *Novoe Vremia* – looked at the events in Epirus in precisely this way.

"Unfortunately, to this day the protocol of Corfu has not been fulfilled and is not being fulfilled by the Albanian side, neither in the part relating to the religious, nor in the part relating to the civil and educational rights of the Greek Epirots. In this sense the unchanging character of Albanian hostility is indicative. In 1914 the Albanian prime-minister Turkhan Pasha declared to the Rome correspondent of *Berliner Tageblatt* that 'there can be no discussion' of the autonomy of Epirus, and 'for us there are no longer any "Epirots", but there are only the inhabitants of provinces united to us by the London conference.' Decades later, in 1967, another Albanian tyrant, Enver Khodja, proclaimed Albania to be the first officially atheist country in the world, where the Orthodox Church was banned and destroyed. The Serbs talk about the destruction of 2000 Orthodox churches." ("Chto neset Pravoslaviu proekt 'Velikoj Albanii'?", *Pravoslavnaia Rus'*, N 2 (1787), January 15/28, 2005, p. 11).

Less impressive, however, were the atrocities committed. Thus "as the Serb soldiery moved to Skopje and beyond, they visited destruction and murder on the local Albanian population. Fired by tales of atrocities committed on Christian peasants during the unrest in the Albanian territories, the Serbs unleashed the full force of nationalist hatred against defenceless villages. A Serb Social Democrat, serving as a reservist, described how 'the horrors actually began as soon as we crossed the old frontier. By five p.m. we were approaching Kumanovo. The sun had set, it was starting to get dark. But the darker the sky became, the more brightly the fearful illumination of the fires stood out against it. Burning was going on all around us. Entire Albanian villages had been turned into pillars of fire… In all its fiery monotony this picture was repeated the whole way to Skopje… For two days before my arrival in Skopje the inhabitants had woken up in the morning to the sight, under the principal bridge over the Vardar – that is, in the very centre of the town – of heaps of Albanian corpses with severed heads. Some said that these were local Albanians, killed by the *komitadjis* [*četniks],* others that the corpses had been brought down to the bridge by the waters of the Vardar. What was clear was that these headless men had not been killed in battle.' In Skopje, the chief instigator of the massacres was the Black Hand, which set up its headquarters close to the Russian consulate in a building soon known as the Black House. The Black Hand, with its network of agents, had escaped the control of the military authorities and was increasingly assuming the role of an informal government of 'liberated Old Serbia'. After several weeks, the government in Belgrade started to appoint civilian administrators to these territories, but those who refused to submit to the demands of the Black Hand and the *četniks* were scared. Branislav Nušić, the writer who had welcomed the war with such enthusiasm, resigned as governor of Bitola in fear and disgust at the activities of these units."[199]

Thus, as Tim Judah, writes, "ethnic cleansing" - unfortunately very common before the Balkan Wars – revived during them: "The Carnegie Endowment's account of the crushing of the Albanian revolt in Kosovo is also important because in 1913 as in 1941 or the 1990s it was quite clear to all involved what the purpose of ethnic cleansing was:

"'Houses and whole villages are reduced to ashes, unarmed and innocent populations massacred *en masse*, incredible acts of violence, pillage and brutality of every kind – such were the means which were employed by the Serbo-Montenegrin soldiery, with a view to the entire transformation of the ethnic character of regions inhabited exclusively by Albanians.

"'We thus arrive at the second characteristic feature of the Balkan wars, a feature which is the necessary correlative of the first. Since the population of the countries about to be occupied knew, by tradition, instinct and experience, what they had to expect from the armies of the enemy and from the

[199] Glenny, op. cit., pp. 233-234.

neighbouring countries to which these armies belonged, they did not await their arrival, but fled. Thus generally speaking, the army of the enemy found on its way nothing but villages which were either half deserted or entirely abandoned. To execute the orders for extermination, it was only necessary to set fire to them. The population, warned by the glow from these fires, fled all in haste. There followed a veritable migration of peoples, for in Macedonia, as in Thrace, there was hardly a spot which was not, at a given moment, on the line of march of some army or other. The Commission everywhere encountered this second fact. All along the railways interminable trains of carts drawn by oxen followed one another; behind them came emigrant families and, in the neighbourhood of the big towns, bodies of refugees were found encamped.'

"Just as conversion had been accepted as a means to escape death in earlier times, in some places it once again became an issue. When the Montenegrins captured the village of Plav, Rebecca West, whose pro-Serbian bent somewhat undermines her otherwise masterly account of Yugoslavia in the 1930s, characteristically dismisses a major massacre as an 'unfortunate *contretemps*'. During this little misunderstanding a former Muslim cleric, now converted to Orthodoxy and a major in the Montenegrin Army, demanded that his former congregation convert. They refused and so 500 of them were shot. In another incident, some Macedonian villagers had their church surrounded by Serbian soldiers during the Sunday service. On emerging they found that a table had been set up on which was a piece of paper and a revolver. Either they could sign that they were Serbs rather than Bulgarians – or they could die. They chose the former option."[200]

This latter incident shows that rivalry and hatred among the Orthodox, especially in Macedonia, had by no means been removed by their alliances against the Turks. It was especially fierce between the Greeks and the Bulgarians. The Greek army had reached the great prize of Salonika only a few hours before the Bulgarians, which upset the Bulgarians. Then, only a few months later, war broke out between the former allies - the Second Balkan War had begun.

A Carnegie Endowment report describes some of the hatred between the Greeks and Bulgarians at this time: "Day after day the Bulgarians were represented as a race of monsters, and public feeling was roused to a pitch of chauvinism which made it inevitable that war, when it should come, should be ruthless. In talk and in print one phrase summed up the general feeling of the Greeks towards the Bulgarians. 'Dhen einai anthropoi!' (They are not human beings). In their excitement and indignation the Greeks came to think of themselves as the appointed avengers of civilization against a race which stood outside the pale of humanity.

[200] Judah, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

"… Deny that your enemies are men, and presently you will treat them as vermin. Only half realizing the full meaning of what he said, a Greek officer remarked to the writer, 'When you have to deal with barbarians, you must behave like a barbarian yourself. It is the only thing they understand.' The Greek army went to war, its mind inflamed with anger and contempt. A gaudily coloured print, which we saw in the streets of Salonika and the Piraeus, eagerly bought by the Greek soldiers returning to their homes, reveals the depth of the brutality to which this race hatred had sunk them. It shows a Greek *evzone* (highlander) holding a living Bulgarian soldier with both hands, while he gnaws the face of the victim with his teeth, like some beast of prey. It is entitled *Bulgarophagos* (Bulgar-eater), and is adorned with the following verses:

The sea of fire which boils in my breast
And calls for vengeance with the savage waves of my soul,
Will be quenched when the monster of Sofia is still,
And thy life blood extinguishes my hate."[201]

It is sometimes asserted that the Christian commandment to love our enemies cannot be applied in a war situation. For it is necessary to obey lawful authorities and fight the enemies of the State. However, personal hatred and unnecessary cruelty are forbidden both in war and peace. Even in the Old Testament, and even in relation to non-Jews, cruelty was forbidden: "You shall not wrong a stranger or oppress him, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt. You shall not afflict any widow or orphan. If you do afflict them, and they cry out to Me, I will surely hear their cry, and My wrath will burn, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall become widows, and your children fatherless" (Exodus 22.21-24).

According to Niall Ferguson, the Balkan Wars "had revealed both the strengths and the limits of Balkan nationalism. Its strength lay in its ferocity. Its weakness was its disunity. The violence of the fighting much impressed the young Trotsky, who witnessed it as a correspondent for the newspaper *Kievskaia mysl*. Even the peace that followed the Balkan Wars was cruel, in a novel manner that would become a recurrent feature of the twentieth century. It no longer sufficed, in the eyes of nationalists, to acquire foreign territory. Now it was peoples as well as borders that had to move. Sometimes these movements were spontaneous. Muslims fled in the direction of Salonika as the Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians advanced in 1912; Bulgarians fled Macedonia to escape from invading Greek troops in 1913; Greeks chose to leave the Macedonian districts ceded to Bulgaria and Serbia by the Treaty of Bucharest. Sometimes populations were deliberately expelled, as the Greeks were from Western Thrace in 1913 and from parts of Eastern Thrace and Anatolia in 1914. In the wake of the Turkish defeat, there was an agreed population exchange: 48,570 Turks moved one way and 46,764 Bulgarians the other across the new Turkish-Bulgarian border. Such exchanges were

[201] Judah, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

designed to transform regions of ethnically mixed settlement into the homogeneous societies that so appealed to the nationalist imagination. The effects on some regions were dramatic. Between 1912 and 1915, the Greek population of (Greek) Macedonia increased by around a third; the Muslim and Bulgarian population declined by 26 and 13 per cent respectively. The Greek population of Western Thrace fell by 80 per cent; the Muslim population of Eastern Thrace rose by a third. The implications were distinctly ominous for the many multi-ethnic communities elsewhere in Europe…

"The alternative to outright war was to create a new South Slav state through terrorism. In the wake of the annexation of Bosnia, a rash of new organizations sprang up, pledged to resisting Austrian imperialism in the Balkans and to liberate Bosnia by fair means or foul…"[202]

The Balkan Wars of 1912-13 constituted a political and military victory for the Balkan Orthodox (except Bulgaria), but a major spiritual defeat for Orthodoxy. Russia had managed to avoid a world war while not betraying her co-religionists. But internal as well as external factors made it increasingly difficult for the Tsar to hold the twin monsters of revolutionary nationalism and internationalist revolution at bay. Moreover, it was now clear that the Balkan Orthodox not only considered themselves as completely independent of any "Third Rome", but were determined to go their own, egotistical ways regardless of the consequences for world peace and the interests of the Orthodox commonwealth as a whole. Judgement was about to descend upon the world, and it would begin at the House of God (I Peter 4.17)…

[202] Ferguson, *The War of the World,* London: Penguin, 2007, pp. 76-77.

22. THE SALT LOSES ITS SAVOUR

Long before the Jews began to join terrorist organizations, or the Masonic intelligentsia to weave their plots against the tsar, the Russian Orthodox people began to fall away from the faith. This was mentioned by Saints Seraphim of Sarov and Tikhon of Zadonsk; and St. Ignatius Brianchaninov spoke about "hypocrisy", "scribes and Pharisees" and "the salt losing its savour". By the eve of the revolution this decline was still more noticeable.

The Church hierarchy was corrupted by renovationists such as Archbishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) and Bishop Antoninus (Granovsky). There were few bishops who spoke out openly against the revolutionary madness.

In the monasteries it was the same story. There were still holy monks and nuns, and the rich crop of monastic martyrs after the revolution showed that the pre-revolutionary sowing was by no means all bad. Nevertheless, the future Elder Gabriel of Seven Lakes was warned by St. Ambrose of Optina "to go wherever he please, so as only not to live in Moscow", where monasticism was at such a low level.[203] A generation later, in 1909, St. Barsanuphius of Optina said: "Contemporary monasticism strives in all things to fulfil its own will. Abba Dorotheus says: 'I know of no other fall for a monk than as a consequence of his own will.'"[204] The ignorance and superstition of the name-worshipping monks did not grow on an empty place; and pseudo-elders such as Rasputin and Iliodor could not have flourished in a more truly pious society.

A particular characteristic of the pre-revolutionary period – and a propaganda gift for the revolutionaries - was the excessive expenditure of the rich and their flagrant immorality. The Romanovs – with the shining exception of the Tsar and Tsarina, Great Princess Elizabeth and some others – were among the worst sinners. The increasing hard-heartedness of wealthy Russian Christians to the poor was bewailed by many leading churchmen, such as St. John of Kronstadt. Both rich and poor tended to forget the Christian teaching on social inequality, namely, that it is an opportunity for the rich to show compassion and for the poor to display patience. [205]

But the rich in every age have been corrupt. What of the poor? In the villages and factories, as we have seen, revolutionary propaganda made deep inroads. Although only a minority of peasants took part in the burning of landowners' estates in the 1905 revolution, by 1917 the experience of the war and the lying propaganda directed against the Tsar and his family had

---

[203] Fr. Simeon Kholmogorov, *One of the Ancients*, Platina, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1988, p. 67.

[204] St. Barsanuphius, in Fomin & Fomina, op. cit., p. 409.

[205] For, as Bishop Nikolai Velimirovich wrote, "it is God's desire that men be unequal in externals: riches, power, status, learning, position and so forth. But he does not recommend any sort of competitiveness in this. God desires that men compete in the multiplying of the inner virtues." (*Homilies*, volume 2).

increased the numbers of deserters, thieves and arsonists. In the elections to the Constituent Assembly in 1918 ***80%*** of the population voted for socialist deputies.[206] Moreover, support for the Bolsheviks in the elections, as Richard Pipes writes, "came not from the region of Jewish concentration, the old Pale of Settlement, but from the armed forces and the cities of Great Russia, which had hardly any Jews".[207] So blame for the Russian revolution must fall on Russians as well as Jews, and not only the aristocratic or Masonic Russians, but on large swathes of the Christian working population.

F. Vinberg writes: "Everyone was guilty! Both the higher circles of the nobility, and the major and minor merchants, and the representatives of science, and the servant classes, and in particular the adulterers of the word, the corrupters of thought, many Russian writers of the last decades, lawyers and professors: for all these categories of Russian citizens there can be no forgiveness for the great crime they committed."[208] And so Ivan Solonevich's words applied to all sections of the population: "With the substitution of faith in absolute Good with faith in relative sausages, everything else also begins to take on a relative character, including man. With the loss of faith in God, loss of faith in man is also lost. The Christian principle, 'love your neighbour as yourself', for your neighbour is *also* a part of absolute Good, is exchanged for another principle: 'man is a means for the production of sausages'. The feeling of absolute morality is lost… Consequently faith ceases to exist not only in man generally, but also in one's 'neighbour' and even in the neighbour himself. And then begins mutual extermination…"[209]

Contrary to popular conceptions, the roots of the Russian revolution are not to be sought in economic or political circumstances. Looking deeper, we may see them in "the mystery of iniquity" foretold by the prophets to reach the acme of its power in the last times. This is the mystery of satanic *rebellion* that arises from within the People of God and leads them to reject the God-established order in Church and State.

As Joseph de Maistre wrote: "There have always been some forms of religion in the world and wicked men who opposed them. Impiety was always a crime, too… *But only in the bosom of the true religion can there be real impiety…* Impiety has never produced in times past the evils which it has brought forth in our day, for its guilt is always directly proportional to the enlightenment which surrounds it… Although impious men have always existed, there never was before the eighteenth century, and in the heart of Christendom, *an insurrection against God*."[210]

---

[206] Edward Roslof, *Red Priests: Renovationism, Russian Orthodoxy, and Revolution, 1905-1946*, Indiana University Press, 2002, p. 15.
[207] Pipes, op.cit., p. 113.
[208] Vinberg, op. cit., p. 7.
[209] I.L. Solonevich, *Narodnaia Monarkhia (The People's Monarchy),* Minsk, 1998, pp. 384, 385.
[210] De Maistre, *On God and Society*; in Fr. Seraphim Rose, *Nihilism*, Platina, Ca.: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood Press, 1994, p. 69.

De Maistre was speaking, of course, about the French revolution, and for him the true religion that was the object of the wrath of the French revolutionaries was – Catholicism. However, we know that Catholicism is only a heresy and schism from the true religion – Orthodox Christianity. It is therefore to the insurrection against God within the heart of Orthodox Christianity – that is, to the Russian revolution – that we must look for the summit of evil that the world has yet seen – always excepting, of course, the killing of God Himself by the Jews. The crime was the worse in that the Tsar whom the revolutionaries killed as being the representative of Christianity was probably the most genuine Christian that has ever sat upon a Christian throne. Not only did he not exploit his people in any way: he brought them immeasurable benefits, both spiritual and material, building churches, canonizing saints, spreading the truth faith, strengthening the economy, helping the poor, introducing just legislation and finally laying down his crown and life in order to save his people from civil war.

When the revolution finally came, and people saw the demonic horror they had voted for, many repented. They realized that they were reaping the fruits of what their own indifference had sown. As Hieromartyr Damascene, Bishop of Glukhov, wrote: "The absence of zeal in Christians and of a firm confession of their faith makes many of our enemies (who do not, of course, consciously arise up against the Holy Spirit) to see in Christianity – hypocrisy, and in the Church – an organization of exploiters. In the same way, the absence in us of Christian zeal can be seen as an indirect reason why those who are perishing in the darkness of atheism and the spite of anti-theism leave the Church. It goes without saying that real, especially spiteful 'rising up against the Lord and against His Christ' has other, deeper, age-old reasons. Still, if such a significant quenching of the spirit of faith and love amidst believers in the preceding age had not taken place, the faithful servants of the prince of darkness would not have found among us so many voluntary and involuntary helpers. It was said at one Masonic congress: 'Russia has preserved the most ardent love for our eternal Enemy, and He Whose name I do not want to name will send a horde of His invisible powers to the defence of the Russian people'… And it was decided in counter-action to this to implant lack of faith in Russia…"[211]

The Lord would indeed have sent "a horde of His invisible powers to the defence of the Russian people" – if they had been worthy of it. But they were not. And so instead of "the mystery of piety", there triumphed "the mystery of iniquity". For, as St. John Maximovich explained: "The sin against him [the Tsar] and against Russia was perpetrated by all who in one way or another acted against him, who did not oppose, or who merely by sympathizing participated in those events which took place forty years ago. That sin lies upon everyone until it is washed away by sincere repentance…"[212]

---

[211] E.L., *Episkopy-Ispovednik (Bishop Confessors),* San Francisco, 1971.

[212] St. John, "Homily before a Memorial Service for the Tsar-Martyr", in *Man of God: Saint John of Shanghai and San Francisco,* Richfield Springs, N.Y, 1994, p. 133.

Archbishop Averky (Taushev) of Syracuse continues the theme: "It is small consolation for us that the Royal Family was killed directly by non-Russian hands, non-Orthodox hands and non-Russian people. Although that is so, *the whole Russian people* is guilty of this terrible, unprecedented evil deed, insofar as it did not resist or stand against it, but behaved in such a way that the evil deed appeared as the natural expression of that mood which by that time had matured in the minds and hearts of the undoubted majority of the unfortunate misguided Russian people, beginning with the 'lowers' and ending with the very 'tops', the upper aristocracy."[213]

[213] Taushev, "Religiozno-misticheskij smysl ubienia Tsarkoj Sem'i" (The Religious-Mystical Meaning of the Killing of the Royal Family), http://www.ispovednik.org/fullest.php?nid=59&binn_rubrik_pl_news=132.

23. THE NAME-WORSHIPPING HERESY

At the beginning of the 20th century the Greek and Russian monks on Mount Athos were not on friendly terms. "The Greeks cannot speak with equanimity about the Russians," wrote I.I. Sokolov, "while the Russians do not speak with approval about the Greeks. The former complain about the unlawful seizure by the Russians of Greek monasteries, cells and lands, while the Russians speak about violence and oppression on the part of the Greeks. And as time passes, mutual dissatisfaction grows, and spitefulness flames up more strongly. We can say that now [at the beginning of the 20th century] we are witnessing a repetition, to some degree, of what happened in the 1870s, during the infamous Greek-Russian law-suit to do with the St. Panteleimon monastery. There can be no doubt that leaven from this suit has not died out, and now in the quarrel between the Greek and Russian monks on Athos we must see a reflection of the earlier turmoil. Ten years ago one could see a certain calm in the mutual dissatisfaction of the Athonite population, but it turns out that this was the calm before a storm that has now broken out 'in the great wilderness of Athos' to quite a significant degree. What is it about?

"In the gradual increase in the numbers of Russian monks on Athos the Greeks see a blow to Hellenism. There was a time, and not so long ago, not more than 30-40 years ago, when there were very few Russian monks on Athos; they had no constant, well-organised refuge, they were poor, and deprived of influence on Athonite affairs. Now their position has changed unrecognisably by comparison with the past. There are now more Russian monks than the Greeks themselves. They have well constructed monasteries and cells, and the main thing – they are rich and do not spare money on acquiring new possessions. They are gradually increasing in numbers and are ready to take over the whole of the Holy Mountain, and squeeze the Greeks completely out. This Russian advance on Athos is based, according to the opinion of the Greeks, on national-political motives: it is the march of Panslavism against Hellenism. It is well-known how attached the Greeks are to their nation, how they preserve all the centres of Hellenism, how they defend every pound of their native soil. And here we are talking about one of the most prominent refuges of Hellenism, the acropolis of the Greek nation, where the Hellenist standard was unfurled already in Byzantine times, and did not disappear in the Turkish era as a consequence of the special international-political position of Athos. Hence arises the enmity which appears in the fact that the Greek monasteries try not to sell to the Russian monks a single clump of land, surround the use of the cells with various obstacles, deprive the elders in the cells of the right of bequeathing them to their disciples, charge inordinate prices for cells and kalyvas, etc. Is such an attitude of the Greeks to the Russians just?

"We think that the enmity of the Greeks towards the Russians is unjustly motivated by considerations of a political nature. The political slant given to Russian monasticism on Athos is an artificial, false thing, which does not correspond to the real strivings of the Russians on Athos. Panslavism, which

the Greeks talk about in relation to the Russian Athonites, is a myth, an empty word, having no definite content. It was created by the immoderately passionate fantasy of the Athonites – or more accurately, of the Athenian intriguers from the Greeks, who see enemies of Hellenism in its most recent formation everywhere: this is a common phenomenon among peoples that are feverish with political tendencies after their birth or rebirth to new public life. The Greeks saw the advance of Panslavism into the East already in the 1870s, when the notorious case of St. Panteleimon's flared up, but even they did not have a clear idea about it, which is why Panslavism was for them some kind of scarecrow. In this respect the matter has not changed even at the present time. Moreover, it would be strange to impute political tendencies to people coming from our remote villages and settlements, who have set off for Athos with exclusively religious aims. After all, Russian Athos can without exaggeration be called 'the peasants' kingdom'. There are very few intelligentsy here – perhaps 50 out of 4000 monks in all. There are also few from the ranks of the upper and lower middle classes, who differ very little from the peasants, so that on Athos the peasantry is the dominant and even the all-engulfing element. The inhabitants of our villages and settlements set off for Athos exclusively for religious motives – to pray and save themselves: what have they to do with politics? And then politicising requires a corresponding intellectual preparation, which the Greek monks possess, but the Russians do not. Justice requires us to say that among the Russian monks of Athos there are very few educated people, the majority are semi-literate: what have they to do with politics? While the leaders of the monks, penetrated with the same ideas of prayer and salvation, are so burdened with the administration of the brotherhood and the complex monastic economy that politics is impossible for them…"[214]

However, while this semi-literacy of the Russian monks made involvement in politics difficult for them, it presented another danger that was soon to reveal itself – a weakness in theological debate and vulnerability to heresy…

This danger became a reality with the publication, in 1907, by Schema-monk Hilarion, of a book on the Jesus prayer entitled *On the Mountains of the Caucasus*. This book was at first well-received and passed the spiritual censor; but later its claim that the name of God *is* God- more precisely, that the Name of God as uttered in the Jesus prayer is not only holy and filled with the grace of God, but is holy *in and of itself*, being *God Himself* - elicited criticism. Soon monastic opinion in Russia was polarised between those who, like the monks of the Kiev Caves Lavra, approved of the book and its name-worshipping thesis (imiabozhie in Russian), and those, like the monks of the Pochaev Lavra and the Optina Desert, who rejected it. The heresy was condemned by the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1912 (Charter No. 8522 of Patriarch Joachim III to Mount Athos, dated September 12) and 1913 (Charter No. 758 of Patriarch

[214] Sokolov, "Afonskoe monashestvo v ego proshlom i sovremennom sostoianii", in *Svt. Grigorij Palama* (Hierarch Gregory Palamas), St. Petersburg, 2004, pp. 237-239.

German V to Mount Athos, dated February 15), and by the Russian Holy Synod in 1913 (Epistle of May 18, and Decree of August 27, No. 7644)[215].

However, as Gubanov writes, "the illiterate G.E. Rasputin interceded for the heretical name-worshippers and even tried to incite the empress to attack the fighters against the heresy of name-worshipping."[216] In 1914 the leading name-worshippers, including Hieroschemamonk Anthony (Bulatovich), author of *An Apology of Faith in the Name of God and the Name of Jesus* (1913), were justified by the Moscow Diocesan Court, which declared: "… The Synodal Office has found that in *the confessions of faith in God and in the Name of God* coming from the named monks, in the words, 'I repeat that in naming the Name of God and the Name of Jesus as God and God Himself, I reject both the veneration of the Name of God as His Essence, and the veneration of the Name of God separately from God Himself as some kind of special Divinity, as well as any deification of the very letters and sounds and any chance thoughts about God' – there is contained information allowing us to conclude that in them there is no basis for leaving the Orthodox Church for the sake of the teaching on the Names of God.' (decree N 1443 of May 8, 1914)".

Of course, this decree did not constitute a "justification" of the name-worshippers' teaching, especially in view of the fact that *on the same day* the Office, led by Metropolitan Macarius, affirmed that name-worshipping – "*the new false-teachings on the names of God proclaimed by Schema-Monk Hilarion and Anthony Bulatovich*" – was a heresy (decree 1442 of May 8, 1914). Moreover, in rejecting "any deification of the very letters and sounds and any chance thoughts about God", Bulatovich was obliged also to renounce his words in the *Apology*: "Every mental representation of a named property of God is the Name of God [and therefore, according to the name-worshippers, God Himself]", "the contemplation of the His name is God Himself", "the conscious naming of God is God Himself", "Every idea about God is God Himself", "we call the very idea of God – God". But did he in fact repent?

Unfortunately, the repentance of the name-worshippers turned out to be fictional. Bulatovich did not repent, but concealed his heresy behind ambiguous words and phrases. Thus on May 18, 1914, in a letter to Metropolitan Macarius, Bulatovich thanked him for his "justification", and nobly deigned to declare that he was now ready to return into communion with the Orthodox Church (!). And he added: "Concerning the Name of God and the Name of Jesus Christ, we, in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Fathers, confessed and confess the Divinity and the Divine Power of the Name of the Lord, but we do not raise this teaching to the level of a dogma, for it has not yet been formulated and dogmatised in council, but we expect that at the forthcoming Council it will be formulated and dogmatised.

---

[215] See *Ekklesiastiki Alitheeia*, N 16, April 20, 1913, pp. 123-125, N 19, May 11, 1913, pp. 145-146, N 11, N 24, June 15, 1913, pp. 187-191, March 15, 1914, p. 119; "O lzhe-uchenii imiabozhnikov", *Tserkovnie Vedomosti*, N 20, 1913.

[216] Gubanov, op. cit., p. 770.

Therefore we, in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Fathers, in the words of the ever-memorable Father John of Kronstadt said and say that the Name of God is God Himself, and the Name of the Lord Jesus is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, understanding this not in the sense of a deification of the created name, but understanding it spiritually, in the sense of the inseparability of the God-revealed Truth, Which is the Action of the Divinity."

These words of Bulatovich show that he was not sincere in his signature below the *Confession of faith in God and in the Name of God*, but deceived Metropolitan Macarius (who was probably under pressure from the Over-Procurator Sabler, who was in turn under pressure from the fervent name-worshippers Gregory Rasputin). "Mixing truth with unrighteousness" (Rom. 1.18), Bulatovich mixed Orthodoxy with heresy. Thus Orthodoxy recognises that there is a "Divine Power" in the name of Jesus, but does *not* recognise that it *is* "Divinity". Again, Orthodoxy recognises that in prayer the name of God is indeed inseparable from God, but it does not *confuse* the two, as does Bulatovich. For while a shadow is inseparable from the body that casts it, this is not to say that the shadow *is* the body. Finally, Bulatovich's "dogma" is still not "formulated and dogmatised in council" – because it is *not* a dogma, but heresy!

The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church accepted that Bulatovich and his fellows had not really repented, so they set aside the decree of the Moscow Synodal Office, and confirmed the sentences against the name-worshippers (decree N 4136 of May 10-24, 1914), which confirmation was again confirmed by decree N 2670 of March 10, 1916. "In this decree of the Most Holy Synod," wrote the future Hieromartyr Bishop Basil (Zelentsov), "we find a confirmation of the basic rule that the name-worshippers must be received into ecclesiastical communion and admitted to the sacraments of the Church only on the unfailing condition that they reject the false teaching of name-worshipping and witness to their faithfulness to the dogmas and teaching of the Church and to their obedience to Church authority."

Although name-worshipping was on the agenda of the 1917-18 Council and a subcommission to study it under the leadership of Archbishop Theophan of Poltava and Fr. Sergius Bulgakov was formed, the subcommission did not have time to complete its work before the Council was terminated by the Bolsheviks. However, on October 8/21, 1918, Patriarch Tikhon and the Most Holy Synod declared: "The Most Holy Synod does not change its former judgement on the error itself [of name-worshipping]… and has in no way changed its general rule, according to which the name-worshippers, as having been condemned by the Church authorities, can be received into Church communion… only after they have renounced name-worshipping and have declared their submission to the Holy Church… The petition of Hieroschemamonk Anthony to allow him to serve is to be recognised as not worthy of being satisfied so long as he continues to disobey Church authority and spread his musings which have been condemned by the Church hierarchy to the harm of the Church".

After this decision, the leading name-worshipper, Anthony Bulatovich, broke communion for the second time with the Russian Church and was shortly afterwards killed by robbers.

The name-worshipping movement survived in the Caucasus and South Russian region (where the Tsar had transported the rebellious monks); and the sophianist heretics Florensky and Bulgakov also confessed name-worshipping in the inter-war period. In modern times the heresy has enjoyed a revival in intellectualist circles in Russia, especially in the works of Hieromonk Gregory (Lourié), who supports the heretical views of Bulatovich, considers him to be a saint, and those who oppose his ideas, including several hieromartyrs of the Russian Church to be "enemies of the Name"!

Reasons for the failure to stamp out the heresy included the comparatively weak defence of the truth produced by the Greek and Russian theologians[217], the aura of martyrdom which was attached to the name-worshippers as a result of their forcible expulsion from Mount Athos to Russia on a Russian cruiser, and the fact that the heresy coincided with the end of the Balkan wars and the transfer of Mount Athos from Turkish to Greek dominion after the Treaty of Bucharest, which meant that mutual suspicions between the Greeks and the Russians concerning the status of Athos hindered a united and thorough approach to the problem. Many took up the cause of the name-worshippers as part of their general attack on the "paralytical" Russian Holy Synod, and the whole debate soon acquired political overtones, with the democratic and socialist left generally taking the side of the name-worshippers and the monarchists taking the side of the Orthodox.[218]

In 1918 Patriarch Tikhon indicated that the controversy needed further study "in essence" at a future Pan-Russian (or Ecumenical) Council. But this did not mean, as some have claimed, that the Church had not delivered its verdict on the question. She has delivered her verdict: but the reasons for that verdict need to be more extensively elaborated, and the "positive" teaching of the Church on the relationship between the uncreated and the created in prayer needs to be expounded still more clearly and thoroughly.[219]

---

[217] The best effort was by S. Troitsky in one of the three reports attached by the Russian Holy Synod to their decision of 1913: "Afonskaia Smuta", *Tserkovnie Vedomosti*, N 20, 1913, pp. 882-909.

[218] See Constantine Papoulides, *Oi Rossoi onomolatroi tou Agiou Orous (The Russian Name-Worshippers of the Holy Mountain)*, Thessaloniki, 1977.

[219] See V. Moss, "The Name of God and the Name-Worshipping Heresy", http:www.orthodoxchristianbooks.com (also in Russian at the same site); E.S. Polischuk (ed.), *Imiaslavia. Antologia (Name-Worshipping. An Anthology)*, Moscow, 2002.

24. SARAJEVO

Most western historians now agree that the first responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War rested with Austria and Germany. The Austrians were looking for an opportunity to crush Serbia once for all. And the Germans used the Austro-Serbian war as an excuse to attack Russia and halt her rise to predominance in Europe.[220] The Austrians wanted to crush Serbia because they perceived the greatest threat to their Empire, which was composed of a patchwork of small peoples, all striving for advantages against each other, to reside in a union of some of those peoples against the central government. And the greatest such threat came from the potential union of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes into a Yugoslav State with its capital in Belgrade… In fact, as David Stephenson writes, "the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were beginning to co-operate as the Yugoslav enthusiasts intended. By 1914 a terrorist campaign had started in Croatia as well as Bosnia. But the most exasperating characteristic of the agitation was Serbia's support for it, at any rate after the 1903 coup that installed King Peter in Belgrade. Previously a secret treaty had given Austria-Hungary a veto over Serbian foreign policy. Now Serbia became more independent and its stance more nationalist. In the 'pig war' of 1906-11 Austria-Hungary retaliated by boycotting Serbia's exports of livestock, but the Serbs found alternative markets and turned from Vienna to Paris as their main artillery supplier. Similarly, despite Austrian hopes in 1908 that annexing Bosnia-Herzegovina would dispel South Slav dreams of unification, covert Serb support for Bosnian separatism persisted. The next upheaval came in 1912-13, when Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro defeated Turkey in the First Balkan War before Bulgaria attacked its former allies and was defeated in its turn in the Second. Austrian pressure limited the Serbs' success by forcing them to evacuate the Adriatic coast (where they had hoped to win sea access) and by sponsoring the creation of Albania as a new state to counterbalance them. None the less, the wars heightened the threat on Austria-Hungary's south-eastern borders. Turkey and Bulgaria were weakened as potential Austrian allies, and in the second war Romania fought alongside Serbia. From being Austria-Hungary's secret partner, Bucharest became another enemy, eyeing the Romanian speakers in Transylvania. Finally, Franz Joseph's new foreign minister, Leopold Berchtold, concluded from the Balkan Wars that working with the other powers through the Concert of Europe achieved little. He got results when in spring 1913 he threatened to use force unless Serbia's ally, Montenegro, transferred the town of Scutari to Albania, and again in October when he demanded that Serbia itself should evacuate Albanian territory. By this stage many Austro-Hungarian leaders agreed with Conrad that only violence could solve the Serbian problem. The main exceptions were [the Hungarian leaders] Tisza and Franz Ferdinand – and after the Sarajevo assassinations, Tisza alone.

[220] For a particularly clear and convincing exposition of this thesis, see David Fromkin, *Europe's Last Summer,* London: Vintage Books, 2004.

"This context helps to explain why the Austrians used the assassinations to force a war they already considered unavoidable. The outrage confirmed Berchtold and Franz Joseph in support of Conrad's views. Tisza was won over by an agreement that Austria-Hungary would not annex more South Slavs, by evidence that Romania would stay neutral, and - above all – by new that Germany encouraged military action. Given Russia's position, this latter was indispensable. Austria-Hungary had long competed with the Russians in south-eastern Europe, but in 1897 the two powers reached an understanding to keep the Balkans 'on ice', and for a decade, while the Russians focussed their attention on Asia, they kept to it. Here again, however, the Bosnian annexation crisis, if a short-term triumph, exacerbated Austria-Hungary's plight in the longer term. In 1908 the Russians, still reeling from their defeat by Japan, could do nothing to support their fellow Slavs in Serbia, but they did not forget their humiliation. In 1912, by contrast, they helped to create the Serb-Bulgarian 'Balkan League' that attacked Turkey in the First Balkan War, and they mobilized thousands of troops in order to deter Austria-Hungary from intervening. Although the Russians urged Serbia to compromise in the Scutari and Albanian crises of 1913, they were clearly becoming more assertive. By 1914 almost all the Austro-Hungarian leaders expected war against Serbia to mean a war against Russia as well, and without German encouragement they would not have risked one. And whereas the Austrians were so focused on their Balkan dilemmas that they accepted a general European war without even seriously discussing it, the Germans were much more conscious of what they were doing. It is ultimately in Berlin that we must seek the keys to the destruction of peace…"[221]

It is ironic that it should have been the murder of Archduke Franz Ferdinand by the Bosnian Serb Gavrilo Princip that gave the Austrians and Germans their chance. For the archduke, following the cautious diplomacy of his father, the Emperor Franz Joseph, had repeatedly opposed plans to go to war with Serbia[222], and had suggested giving the Slavs equal power with the Germans and Hungarians in the Austrian empire. More than ironic, and deeply symbolic, was the date of the murder, June 28. For this was the date of the Battle of Kosovo in 1389, when a Serb had assassinated the Turkish sultan. The Austrian archduke now took the place of the Turkish sultan, and once again the survival of Serbia as an independent kingdom was at stake…

Stephenson writes: "It was the Habsburg monarchy's response to Sarajevo that caused a crisis. Initially all it seemed to do was order an investigation. But secretly the Austrians obtained a German promise of support for drastic retaliation. On 23 July they presented an ultimatum to their neighbour, Serbia. Princip and his companions were Bosnians (and therefore Habsburg subjects), but the ultimatum alleged they had conceived their plot in Belgrade, that Serbian officers and officials had supplied them with their weapons, and that Serbian frontier authorities had helped them across the border. It called on

[221] Stevenson, *1914-1918: The History of the First World War,* London: Penguin, 2005, pp. 14-16.
[222] Fromkin, op. cit., p. 302.

Serbia to denounce all separatist activities, ban publications and organizations hostile to Austria-Hungary, and co-operate with Habsburg officials in suppressing subversion and conducting a judicial inquiry. The Belgrade government's reply, delivered just within the forty-eight hours deadline, accepted nearly every demand but consented to Austrian involvement in a judicial inquiry only if that inquiry was subject to Serbia's constitution and to international law. The Austrian leaders in Vienna seized on this pretext to break off relations immediately, and on 28 July declared war. The ultimatum impressed most European governments by its draconian demands, although if Serbian complicity was indeed as alleged the substance of the document was arguably moderate…"[223]

This last remark is misleading: the Austrian document was immoderate in the extreme and demanded an interference in the affairs of a sovereign state that was unprecedented and unjustified even if the Austrian charge – that Belgrade had supported the terrorists – had been true. But it was not. As Rebecca West writes: "It is clear, and nothing could be clearer, that certain Serbian individuals supplied the [Bosnian] conspirators with encouragement arms. But this does not mean that the Serbian Government was responsible…

"There were overwhelming reasons why the Serbian Government should not have supported this or any other conspiracy. It cannot have wanted war at that particular moment. The Karageorges must have been especially anxious to avoid it. King Peter had just been obliged by chronic ill-health to appoint his son Alexander as regent and it had not escaped the attention of the Republican Party that the King had had to pass over his eldest son, George, because he was hopelessly insane. Mr. Pashitch and his Government can hardly have been more anxious for a war, as their machine was temporarily disorganized by preparations for a general election. Both alike, the royal family and the Ministers, held disquieting knowledge about the Serbian military situation. Their country had emerged from the two Balkan wars victorious but exhausted, without money, transport, or munitions, and with a peasant army that was thoroughly sick of fighting. They can have known no facts to offset these, for none existed. Theoretically, they could only rely on the support of France and Russia, and possibly Great Britain, but obviously geography would forbid any of these powers giving her practical aid in the case of an Austrian invasion.

"In fact, the Karageorges and the Government knew perfectly well that, if there should be war, they must look forward to an immediate defeat of the most painful sort, for which they could receive compensation only should their allies, whoever they might be, at some uncertain time win a definite victory. But if there should be peace, then the Karageorges and the Government could consolidate the victories they had won in the Balkan wars, develop their conquered territory [the Serbs had doubled their territory and increased their population from 2.9 to 4.4 million], and organize their

[223] Stevenson, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

neglected resources. Admittedly Serbia aimed at the ultimate absorption of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and the South Slav provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. But this was not the suitable moment. If she attained her aims by this method she would have to pay too heavy a price, as, in fact, she did. No country would choose to realize any ideal at the cost of the destruction of one-third of her population. That she did not so choose is shown by much negative evidence. At the time the murder was committed she had just let her reservists return home after their annual training, her Commander-in-chief was taking a cure at an Austrian spa, and none of the Austrian Slavs who had fought in the Balkan War and returned home were warned to come across the frontier. But the positive evidence is even stronger. When Austria sent her ultimatum to Serbia, which curtly demanded not only the punishment of the Serbians who were connected with the Sarajevo attentat, but the installation of Austrian and Hungarian officers in Serbia for the purpose of suppressing Pan-Slavism, Mr. Pashitch bowed to all the demands save for a few gross details, and begged that the exceptions he had made should not be treated as refusals but should be referred for arbitration to The Hague Tribunal. There was not one trace of bellicosity in the attitude of Serbia at this point."[224]

Moreover, the Serbs had warned the Austrian minister in charge of the Sarajevo visit that a plot was afoot. And, as Stephenson admits, "the summary time limit gave the game away, as did the peremptory rejection of Belgrade's answer. The ultimatum had been intended to start a showdown…"[225] In any case, justice required that the trial of the assassins should take place before it could be concluded that the Serbian Government was guilty. But in fact the trial began a full ten weeks after Austria declared war on Serbia. And then nothing implicating the Serbian government was discovered. As Princip said: "Anyone who says that the inspiration for this attentat came from outside our group is playing with the truth. We originated the idea, and we carried it out. We loved the people. I have nothing to say in my defence."[226]

"Before dispatching their ultimatum to Belgrade the Austrians sent the head of Berchtold's private office, Count Hoyos, to Germany. Hoyos convened a memorandum from Berchtold and a letter from Franz Joseph, both of which strongly hinted at war with Serbia without being explicit. But when the German Emperor Wilhelm II met Hoyos on 5 July, he responded that Austria-Hungary must 'march into Serbia', with Germany's backing even if war with Russia resulted. The next day the German chancellor (head of government), Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg, reaffirmed the message. Following this secret assurance – usually referred to as the 'blank cheque' – Wilhelm went cruising in the Baltic, while Bethmann and his foreign minister Gottliev von Jagow urged the Austrians first to send the ultimatum and then to declare war without delay, while advising them to disregard British

[224] West, op. cit., pp. 366-368.
[225] Stevenson, op. cit., p. 11.
[226] West, op. cit., p. 376.

proposals to refer the crisis to a conference. Only on 28-29 July, after Austria-Hungary had declared war on Serbia, did the Germans urge Vienna to compromise. But once it became clear that Russia was supporting Serbia and had started military preparations the Germans plunged ahead, issuing ultimatums to Russia and its ally, France, on 31 July and declaring war on them on 1 and 3 August respectively. By simultaneously demanding that Belgium should allow free passage for German troops they also brought in Britain, which declared war on Germany on 4 August. Germany willed a local war between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, deliberately raised a continental war against France and Russia, and finally actually started one…"[227]

So the Germans and Austrians were indeed the aggressors and the guilty ones. In a deeper sense, however, the Serbian and other Balkan nations were guilty of having encouraged, over a period of generations, that nationalist-revolutionary mentality which, among many other factors, brought down the civilized world. Thus it is fact denied by nobody that Princip and his fellow conspirators were helped by the secret nationalist society known as the "Black Hand".

"This society," writes West, "had already played a sinister part in the history of Serbia. It was the lineal descendant of the group of officers who had killed King Alexander and Queen Draga and thus exchanged the Obrenovitch dynasty for the Karageorgevitsh. The Karageorges, who had played no part in this conspiracy, and had had to accept its results passively, have never resigned themselves to the existence of the group, and were continually at odds with them. The 'Black Hand' was therefore definitely anti-Karageorgevitch and aimed at war with Austria and the establishment of a federated republic of Balkan Slavs. Their leader was a man of undoubted talent but far too picturesque character called Dragutin Dmitriyevitch, known as 'Apis', who had been for some time the head of the Intelligence Bureau of the Serbian General Staff."[228]

'Apis', besides taking part in the regicide of 1903, confessed to participation in plots to murder King Nicholas of Montenegro, King Constantine of Greece, Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany and King Ferdinand of Bulgaria![229] That such a murderous fanatic should be in charge of Serbia's military intelligence tells us much about the influence within Serbia of the nationalist-revolutionary heresy.

"In fact," as Stephenson writes, "Serbia's army and intelligence service were out of control."[230] They were brought back under control only three years later, after the nation had gone through fire and water. In 1917 'Apis' was tried and executed…

---

[227] Stephenson, op. cit., p. 16.
[228] West, op. cit., p. 358.
[229] West, op. cit., p. 369.
[230] Stevenson, op. cit., p. 12.

25. GERMANY AND RUSSIA

The most important destabilising factor in European politics before 1914, besides the South Slav problem, was the increasing economic and military power of the German empire. In order to counter this, Russia formed an alliance with France in 1894, which was later joined by Britain. "The division of Europe into two military alliances," writes Dominic Lieven, "made it almost certain that any conflict between great powers would engulf the entire continent. Nevertheless, in the first decade of Nicholas's reign Russia's relations with Berlin and Vienna were friendly. This was in part because much of Petersburg's attention was devoted to the Far East, which in turn made it easier to agree with Austria on a policy of supporting the status quo in the Balkans.

"Russia's defeat by Japan in 1904-05 and the subsequent Russian revolution of 1905-06 changed matters very much for the worse. Awareness of Russian impotence encouraged first Germany and then Austria to defend their interests in the Moroccan Crisis of 1905-06 and in the 1908-09 Bosnian crisis in a more aggressive manner than would otherwise have been the case. In Berlin's defence, however, it does need to be stressed that Germany did not seize the opportunity offered by Russia's weakness to impose its domination on Europe, as it could easily have done at any time between 1905 and 1909. The Russian government, acutely aware both of its international vulnerability and of its lack of prestige at home, became over-fearful of Austrian aggression in the Balkans after 1909, against which it helped to organize a league of Balkan states. The latter's existence in turn contributed to instability in the Balkan peninsula and to Russo-Austrian tensions. The tsarist regime's position was also challenged by the emergence of liberal-nationalist political parties in Russian which asserted their patriotic credentials by stressing Russia's mission in the Balkans and contrasting their own support for that mission with the government's caution and cowardice. Under all these pressures, a gap opened between Petersburg's strong rhetorical defence of its international interests and its actual willingness to stand up for these interests when challenged. Russia's rivals were thereby rather encouraged to discount Petersburg's pronouncements and to believe that pressure would bring rewards. This mattered in 1914.

"In the period 1911-14 the Ottoman empire appeared to be on the verge of disintegration. Defeat by the Italians in 1911-12 and then by the Balkan League in 1912-13 was accompanied by political turmoil in Constantinople. The fate of the Ottoman lands and of the Balkans affected the interests of all the major European powers and had major implications for the European balance of power. As regards the Balkans, the powers most involved were Austria and Russia. Both general staffs attached great importance to the support of the Balkan states' armies in the event of a European war. The likelier the latter became, the more this priority obsessed Petersburg and Vienna. For the Russians, Constantinople and the Straits possessed huge

strategic and economic importance. In the event of a great power rival controlling the Straits, Russia's Black Sea trade and ports would be at the latter's mercy, as would the grain exports on which the empire's commerce and finances rested. Constantinople was also important to Austria, but still more so was the threat of Balkan nationalism to domestic stability within the multi-ethnic Habsburg empire. The Balkan wars of 1912-13 had greatly enlarged Serbian and Rumanian territory, together with the ambitions and self-confidence of Serbian and Rumanian nationalists. The Habsburg Monarchy contained large and discontented Serbian and Rumanian minorities. In 1914 Vienna feared that it would soon lose all its influence over the independent Balkan states, which in turn would contribute to its inability to control the Slav and Rumanian populations of the Monarchy. In more general terms, the rulers of the Habsburg state believed that a reassertion of the empire's power and vitality was essential in order to overawe its potential foreign and domestic enemies, and to contradict the widely prevalent assumption that the Monarchy was moribund and doomed to disappear in the era of nationalism and democracy. The Austrian ultimatum to Serbia of July 1914 was, of course, also designed to punish Belgrade for the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand: more basically, however, it aimed to turn Serbia into an Austrian protectorate and to reassert the Habsburg regime's power and prestige both in the Balkans and at home.

"The Austrian ultimatum to Serbia faced the Russian government with a terrible dilemma. In 1914 Russia's rulers did not want war. Whatever hankering Nicholas II may ever have had for military glory had been wholly dissipated by the Japanese war. That conflict had taught the whole ruling elite that war and revolution were closely linked. Though war with Germany would be more popular than conflict with Japan had been, its burdens and dangers would also be infinitely greater. Russian generals usually had a deep respect for the German army, to which on the whole they felt their own army to be inferior. Above all, Russian leaders had every reason to feel that time was on their side. In strictly military terms, there was good reason to postpone conflict until the so-called 'Great Programme' of armaments was completed in 1917-18. In more general terms, Russia already controlled almost one-sixth of the world's land surface, whose hitherto largely untapped potential was now beginning to be developed at great speed. It was by no means only Petr Stolypin who believed that, given 20 years of peace, Russia would be transformed as regards its wealth, stability and power. Unfortunately for Russia, both the Germans and the Austrians were well aware of all the above facts. Both in Berlin and Vienna it was widely believed that fear of revolution would stop Russia from responding decisively to the Austro-German challenge: but it was also felt that war now was much preferable to a conflict a decade hence.

"In fact, for the Russian government it was very difficult not to stand up to the Central Powers in July 1914. The regime's legitimacy was at stake, as were the patriotism, pride and self-esteem of the key decision-makers. Still more to the point was the conviction that weakness would fatally damage Russia's

international position and her security. If Serbia became an Austrian protectorate, that would allow a very significant diversion of Habsburg troops from the southern to the Russian front in the event of a future war. If Russia tamely allowed its Serbian client to be gobbled up by Austria, no other Balkan state would trust its protection against the Central Powers. All would move into the latter's camp, as probably would the Ottoman empire. Even France would have doubts about the usefulness of an ally so humiliatingly unable to stand up for its prestige and its vital interests. Above all, international relations in the pre-1914 era were seen to revolve around the willingness and ability of great powers to defend their interests. In the age of imperialism, empires that failed to do this were perceived as moribund and ripe for dismemberment. In the judgement of Russian statesmen, if the Central Powers got away with the abject humiliation of Russia in 1914 their appetites would be whetted rather than assuaged. At some point in the near future vital interest would be threatened for which Russia would have to fight, in which case it made sense to risk fighting now, in the hope that this would deter Berlin and Vienna, but in the certainty that if war ensued Serbia and France would fight beside Russia, and possibly Britain and certain other states as well."[231]

When all is said and done, there can be no doubt that the First World War was initiated by Catholic Austria-Hungary and Protestant Germany against Orthodox Serbia and Russia. The proof of the guilt of the western powers, and of the sincere desire of the Orthodox powers to avert war by all honourable means is contained in the telegrams exchanged between Tsar Nicholas and the Serbian regent, Prince Alexander in the last hours before the catastrophe.

Prince Alexander, who had commanded the First Serbian Army in the Balkan wars, wrote to Tsar Nicholas: "The demands of the Austro-Hungarian note unnecessarily represent a humiliation for Serbia and are not in accord with the dignity of an independent state. In a commanding tone it demands that we officially declare in *Serbian News,* and also issue a royal command to the army, that we ourselves cut off military offensives against Austria and recognize the accusation that we have been engaging in traitrous intrigues as just. They demand that we admit Austrian officials into Serbia, so that together with ours they may conduct the investigation and control the execution of the other demands of the note. We have been given a period of 48 hours to accept everything, otherwise the Austro-Hungarian embassy will leave Belgrade. We are ready to accept the Austro-Hungarian demands that are in accord with the position of an independent state, and also those which would be suggested by Your Majesty; everyone whose participation in the murder is proven will be strictly punished by us. Certain demands cannot be carried out without changing the laws, and for that time is required. We have been given too short a period… They can attack us after the expiry of the period, since Austro-Hungarian armies have assembled on our frontier. It is

[231] Lieven, "Russia, Europe and World War I", in Edward Acton, Vladimir Cherniaev, William Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 41-46.

impossible for us to defend ourselves, and for that reason we beseech Your Majesty to come as soon as possible to our aid…"

To this the Tsar replied on July 14/27: "In addressing me at such a serious moment, Your Royal Highness has not been mistaken with regard to the feelings which I nourish towards him and to my heart-felt disposition towards the Serbian people. I am studying the present situation with the most serious attention and My government is striving with all its might to overcome the present difficulties. I do not doubt that Your Highness and the royal government will make this task easier by not despising anything that could lead to a decision that would avert the horrors of a new war, while at the same time preserving the dignity of Serbia. All My efforts, as long as there is the slightest hope of averting bloodshed, will be directed to this aim. If, in spite of our most sincere desire, success is not attained, Your Highness can be assured that in no case will Russia remain indifferent to the fate of Serbia."

Austria invaded Serbia the next day, which was followed by Russia's partial mobilization. However, the Tsar made one last appeal to the Kaiser: "I foresee that very soon I shall be overwhelmed by the pressure brought upon me and forced to take extreme measures which will lead to war." On July 30 the Kaiser replied that he was neutral in the Serbian question (which he was not). Sazonov then advised the Tsar to undertake a full mobilization because "unless he yielded to the popular demand for war and unsheathed the sword in Serbia's behalf, he would run the risk of a revolution and perhaps the loss of his throne". Nicholas was shocked: "Just think of the responsibility you're advising me to assume!" he replied. But, with great reluctance, he gave the order for full mobilization on July 31. Germany then declared war on Russia on July 19 / August 1, the feast of St. Seraphim of Sarov.

It was not simply fear of popular opinion in favour of war that moved the Tsar to make his fateful decision. He knew that if resisting popular national feeling could lead to revolution, an unsuccessful war would lead to it still more surely. The decisive factor in his decision was the obligation to defend Serbia, which was tied to Russia not only by ties of blood, but by the Orthodox Faith. And if one good thing came out of the First World War it was the strengthening of that bond both during and after it. For as Prince Alexander replied to the Tsar: "Difficult times cannot fail to strengthen the bonds of deep attachment that link Serbia with Holy Slavic Rus', and the feeling of eternal gratitude for the help and defence of Your Majesty will be reverently preserved in the hearts of all Serbs."

As the Serbian Bishop Nicholas (Velimirovich) of Zhicha, wrote: "Great is our debt to Russia. The debt of Serbia to Russia, for help to the Serbs in the war of 1914, is huge – many centuries will not be able to contain it for all following generations. This is the debt of love, which without thinking goes to its death, saving its neighbour. 'There is no greater love than this, that a man should lay down his life for his neighbour.' These are the words of Christ. The Russian Tsar and the Russian people, having taken the decision to enter the

war for the sake of the defence of Serbia, while being unprepared for it, knew that they were going to certain destruction. The love of the Russians for their Serbian brothers did not fear death, and did not retreat before it. Can we ever forget that the Russian Tsar, in subjecting to danger both children and millions of his brothers, went to his death for the sake of the Serbian people, for the sake of its salvation? Can we be silent before Heaven and earth about the fact that our freedom and statehood were wroth more to Russia than to us ourselves? The Russians in our days repeated the Kosovo tragedy. If the Russian Tsar Nicholas II had been striving for an earthly kingdom, a kingdom of petty personal calculations and egoism, he would be sitting to this day on his throne in Petrograd. But he chose the Heavenly Kingdom, the kingdom of sacrifice in the name of the Lord, the kingdom of Gospel spirituality, for which he lay down his own head, for which his children and millions of his subject lay down their heads…"[232]

[232] Victor Salni and Svetlana Avlasovich, "Net bol'she toj liubvi, kak esli kto polozhit dushu svoiu za drugi svoia" (There is no greater love than that a man should lay down his life for his friend), http://catacomb.org.ua/modules.php?name=Pages&go=print_page*pid=966.

26. THE WAR AND THE REVOLUTION

The First World War represented a last chance for the Orthodox Russian Empire and the Orthodox commonwealth in general to re-establish its unity under the Tsar, to see the western heretics, both Catholics and Protestants, for the spiritual threat they really were[233], and to expiate their sins before God. The outcome of the military struggle was secondary to these primary, spiritual concerns. As it turned out, Russia and Romania lost that struggle, while their allies Serbia and Greece emerged on the winning side in spite of very heavy losses (Bulgaria fought on the German side, and so lost in the end).

There were certainly spiritual gains. The outbreak of the war seemed to unite the Russian people in defence of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality"; and many sons of the Fatherland died good deaths in a good cause. In 1915 after the Tsar himself took on the mantle of commander-in chief, the Russian armies routed the Austrians and reunited Austrian Galicia, with its Orthodox population, to the Orthodox empire, thereby completing "the gathering of the Russian lands" that had been the aim of the Russian tsars for so many generations.

But the recovery was short-lived, and soon Russian armies were retreating. Poland was abandoned, giving traitors within the Duma the opportunity to raise their defeatist and anti-Orthodox voices against the Lord and against His Anointed. The matter was not helped by major errors in military and domestic policy. For example, during the retreat from Poland and Belorussia it was decided to evacuate the Jews who were particularly numerous in that region (it was the Pale of Settlement) because it was suspected that many of them were spying for the enemy. Whether these suspicions were justified or not, the evacuation clogged up roads and railways, and supplies and troops that were desperately needed for the front could not get through the chaos. A still more serious consequence was that the authorities, instead of using the loss of the Pale to keep large numbers of the chief enemies of the empire outside the empire, imported them into the major cities of the heartland at just the moment when revolution was in the air…

The roots of that revolution have usually been seen in lack of freedom, economic poverty and social inequality. Poverty and inequality, of course, existed, and they increased during the Great War, as in every war and in every combatant country. But Russia during the reign of the Tsar Nicholas II, far from being an exceptionally poor country by historical standards, was

[233] Unfortunately, but not, perhaps, surprisingly, the spiritual threat of the German and Austrian heretics was perceived, but not that of the English and French. Thus "in Serbia at every religious service, prayers are offered for victory over the Enemy; and if a Bishop celebrates a Liturgy, he, with Holy Host in hand, mentions the Serbian King, the English King, the Russian Tsar, the Belgian King and the French Government" (Bishop Nikolai Velimirovich, "Christianity and the War", in *Sabrana Dela (Collected Works)*, Khimelstir, 1986, vol. 3, p. 156.

distinguished rather by its rapidly increasing wealth – in all classes of the population.

More important in the immediate pre-revolutionary generations than the existence of poverty and inequality as such was the increasing hard-heartedness of wealthy Russian Christians to the poor – and the increasing refusal of the poor, under the influence of atheist propaganda, to accept their lot with Christian patience. Both rich and poor tended to forget the Christian teaching on social inequality, namely, that it is an opportunity for the rich to show compassion and for the poor to display patience. For, as Bishop Nikolai Velimirovich wrote, "it is God's desire that men be unequal in externals: riches, power, status, learning, position and so forth. But he does not recommend any sort of competitiveness in this. God desires that men compete in the multiplying of the inner virtues."[234]

As for freedom, it is a paradoxical but true fact that Russia in the last decades before the revolution was one of the freest countries in the world. Thus Duma deputy Baron A.D. Meyendorff admitted: "The Russian Empire was the most democratic monarchy in the world".[235] This view was echoed by foreign observers, such as Sir Maurice Baring: "There is no country in the world, where the individual enjoys so great a measure of personal liberty, where the 'liberté de moeurs' is so great, as in Russia; where the individual man can do as he pleases with so little interference or criticism on the part of his neighbours, where there is so little moral censorship, where liberty of abstract thought or aesthetic production is so great."[236]

Anti-monarchism was only one of the forms of that great rebellion which possessed Russia at this time. Others included theosophy, occultism, spiritism, pornography and Freemasonry.[237]

In 1922 the Mason Boris Telepneff, Russian Assistant Consul in Paris, wrote: "At the beginning of 1906 about fifteen Russians, well-known for their social and political activities, mostly members of the constitutional-democratic party, joined French Lodges; some became members of the Grand Orient, but the majority entered two Lodges under the Supreme Council of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite – "Kosmos" and "Mount-Sinai". On returning to Russia, they formed two provisional Lodges, "The Polar Star" in Petersburg and "Regeneration" in Moscow. In May, 1908, both Lodges were solemnly opened by two members of the High Council of the Grand Orient, specially sent for that purpose from Paris. At the same time the Grand Orient of France established two Lodges, one in Petersburg ("Phoenix") and one in

---

[234] Bishop Nikolai Velimirovich, *Homilies*, volume 2.
[235] Lebedev, op. cit., p. 405.
[236] Baring, in Eugene Lyons, *Our Secret Allies*, 1953.
[237] Maria Carlson, *"No Religion Higher than Truth": A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875-1922*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993; Nina Berberova, *Liudi i Lozhi: russkie masony XX stoletia* (People and Lodges: Russian Masons of the 19th Century), New York: Rossica, 1986.

Moscow. Russian Lodges obtained the right to establish further Lodges without interference from Paris, and accordingly in 1908 and 1909 two more Lodges were opened. "The Iron Ring" in Nizhni-Novgorod and one in Kiev. The existence of Masonic Lodges was discovered by the Russian Government in 1909; it also became known to the authorities that they were of French origin. It was then decided by the Russian Lodges to suspend work, and this was done accordingly until 1911, when some of their members decided to renew their activities with due prudence. One would not call these activities Masonic in any sense, as their chief aim was purely political – the abolition of the autocracy, and a democratic regime in Russia; they acknowledged allegiance to the Grand Orient of France. This political organization comprised about forty Lodges in 1913. In 1915-1916 disagreements arose between their members who belonged to two political parties (the constitutional democrats and the progressives) and could not agree on a common policy. Ten Lodges became dormant. The remaining thirty Lodges continued to work, and took part in the organization of the 1917 March revolution and in the establishment of the Provisional Government. Their political aim being attained, the organisation began to decay; twenty-eight Lodges existed on the eve of the Bolshevik revolution, and since then most of their members have left Russia."[238]

"Telepneff reported that two Russian Lodges had been formed in Paris under the auspices of the Grand Lodge of France while a Russian Lodge existed in Berlin, the Northern Star Lodge, under a warrant of the Grand Lodge of the Three Globes.

"Futile attempts to re-establish Russian Freemasonry met with the mandate of the 4th Congress of the Communist International in Moscow which required all Communist Masons to sever their lodge membership. They could not be considered for important posts in the new reign until two years after their severance. In 1925 Telepneff wrote that 'regular Masonic activities of every description have ceased in Russian proper, due to the severe restrictions imposed by the Bolshevik authorities'."[239]

"An independent lodge of the so-called Martiniste Rite was formed among the entourage of Czar (sic) Nicholas II under the name of 'The Cross and the Star'. Nicholas was said to have been a member of this lodge, which suspended its work in 1916. Other Martiniste lodges opened ... 'Apollonius' in St Petersburg (1910), 'St John' in Moscow (1911), 'St Andrew' in Kiev (1912). A very curious lodge existed among the Russian Navy League, calling themselves 'Philaletes'; beside philanthropic and intellectual work, it pursued a political aim in opposition to that of the Grand Orient lodges, namely the support of the monarchy of Nicholas II. Probably this movement arose in

[238] Richard Rhoda, "Russian Freemasonry: A New Dawn", a paper read at the Orient Lodge no. 15 on June 29, 1996, http://members.aol.com/houltonme/rus/htm.
[239] Richard Rhoda, "Russian Freemasonry: A New Dawn", a paper read at the Orient Lodge no. 15 on June 29, 1996, http://members.aol.com/houltonme/rus/htm.

connection with the Paris branch of the Swiss Order of the Chevaliers 'Philaletes' which established two lodges in St. Petersburg: 'The Pyramid of the North' and 'The Star of the North'. Both pursued studies of mysticism and symbolism." (Boris Telepneff, An Outline of the History of Russian Freemasonry, cited by Angel.)[240]

The Duma leaders Rodzyanko and Guchkov, who were prominent in the plot to force the Tsar to abdicate, were Masons. So were the leaders of the Provisional Government - as Tsuyoshi Hasegawa writes: "Five members, Kerensky, N.V. Nekrasov, A.I. Konovalov, M.I. Tereshchenko and I.N. Efremov are known to have belonged to the secret political Masonic organization."[241] Kerensky belonged to the "Grand Orient of the Peoples of Russia" and the Scottish Rite (32nd degree).[242]

Most dangerous of all were those Orthodox Church activists who sought to reform Church life on Protestantizing, renovationist lines. In 1917 the future Hieromartyr Nicon, Archbishop of Vologda, said: "In recent times we have been infected with the fashion for every kind of change; we philosophise too much and we apply the measure of our own philosophising to the Church herself, forgetting that she is the Kingdom that is not of this world, as the Lord said to Pilate, that its basic principles are unchanging, that to touch them is criminal, that they are eternal, as is the Church herself, and that he who rejects them has already left the Church and ceased to be a Christian... That is what all our 'renovationists', 'revivalists' and 'transformers' of Church life must remember, if they want to remain faithful sons of the Orthodox Church. If they are her sons, then from them is required first of all filial obedience, otherwise they will turn out to be self-called, and capable of creating a schism in the depths of the Church."[243]

*

A similar malady was to be found in all the Orthodox nations during the war… Thus in 1916 two-thirds of Romania was occupied by the Germans, Austro-Hungarians, Bulgarians and Turks. King Ferdinand I (1865-1927) withdrew to Iaşi, while Germany appointed a military governor for Wallachia. The Germans then introduced a decree that Christmas of 1916 and New Year's Day of 1917 should be celebrated according to the western calendar. On December 29, 1916 (Old Style) Archimandrite Galaction (Cordun) wrote to Metropolitan Primate Conon: "The issue that today preoccupies all strata of Romanian society in the territories under foreign

---

[240] Dennis Stock, Russian Freemasonry, http://www.casebook.org/dissertations/freemasonry/russianfm.html.

[241] Hasegawa, "The February Revolution", in Edward Acton, Vladimir Cherniaev, William Rosenberg (eds.), *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914-1921*, Bloomington and Indianopolis: Indiana University Press, 1997, p.59.

[242] George Sprukts, "Re: [paradosis] Re: White army, orthodox-tradition@yahoogroups.com, June 9, 2004.

[243] Archbishop Nicon, "Beregite osnovnia nachala tserkovnoj zhizni", N 366, 1917.

occupation is, without doubt, the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar, imposed on us by the German government for use by our Church, even after the passing of the New Year and our Orthodox Theophany. From the standpoint of the traditional law and practice observed in the Eastern Orthodox Church from time immemorial, this innovation, which does not involve, in and of itself, an immutable dogma, but rather a difference of eleven or thirteen days between one calendar and the other, will nonetheless be a great moral blow for our Orthodox people, but, at the same time, a huge success for the Roman Catholic Church, whose hand can be seen here, too, in that, by availing herself of the German authorities, she is now endeavouring to force us to adopt her calendar, especially in the present circumstances, when the mission of the occupying body and its concerns are directed towards something totally different from what Romanians celebrate at Pascha, Christmas, and New Year, and especially when we can anticipate that even the occupation of our territory will not remain in effect once peace has been established and measures are taken to ensure the proper administration of our territory."

It was not only the Catholics that Fr. Galaction feared, but also the "renegades" from the ranks of the Orthodox: "In the hand that is trying to orchestrate this arrangement, I can detect hiding with the greatest of caution under the mask of Catholicism the shadows of those renegades from our ranks who left because their exaggerated personal expectations were not fulfilled. Serving the cause of the enemy Church in this way, they are yearning to win there some miserable glory and a recompense greater than the thirty pieces of silver, the price of selling the traditions of the Lord's Church. For this reason, as Your Eminence's humble servant, I declare that you must energetically defend our traditional rights, and that I am ready to defend you, even at the price of my life, sacrificing the last drop of my blood out of respect for our ecclesiastical institutions and for the traditions inherited from our forefathers. Therefore, Your Eminence, make a grand gesture. Stretch forth your Archpastoral staff and defend with all courage the holy treasure that is entrusted to you. You are living in an age and in a situation in which you can no longer expect anything from the world. Out of respect for the position that you occupy, you must be willing to unite with the Lord in the struggle to preserve what He has established. If you come forth to fight with zeal, you will revive the memory of the great Metropolitans and patriots of our past, who were ready to die defending our traditional rights and ecclesiastical traditions with their pastoral staffs."[244]

In another pastoral letter, Archimandrite Galaction wrote further about the Judases among the Romanian Orthodox clergy during the German occupation, and prophesied about the coming period of unparalleled suffering in the history of Orthodox Church: "The deadly enemies of the truth

[244] Archimandrite Galaction, in Constantin Bujor, *Resisting unto Blood: Sixty-Five Years of Persecution of the True (Old Calendar) Orthodox Church of Romania (October 1924 – December 1989),* Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2003, pp. 28-29.

and of the teachings of Christ are proudly rising again: the firmament of His Church is becoming covered more and more by dark clouds portending a storm. The time has come for Christ to gather again with His Disciples in hidden chambers for fear of the Jews. In these days, it seems that He will come again to the Garden of Gethsemane and to Golgotha for His Passion. He is waiting for help, but there is no help, because if those in positions of leadership today were ordered to imprison the representatives of Christ and demolish His Churches, they would do so with a clear conscience, convinced that they had merely fulfilled an obligation imposed on them by the ordeal through which both of our vital institutions, the Church and the State, are passing.

"In these hard days for us, there are servants of the Altar, like Annas and Caiaphas, who bear the titles of Bishops and Priests and who, for the security of their personal lives (since the security that comes from the Lord's Church, in Whose Name they were Consecrated as servants, is of no further interest to them), have loudly declared that the Church of Christ and His institutions have grown old and are no longer relevant to our progressive times! There are Judases who, first with calumnies and then with betrayals, wish to humiliate the Lord and His Church, and as many disciples as they can find, they will seize and hand over to the authorities.

"O beloved, Golgotha is lifted up anew, for Christ is coming to be crucified again. The crowd will look at this sight with indifference, and it would not be surprising if at one point they would want to shout for a new teacher to replace Christ, because the old laws are obsolete and no longer have any relevance to our progressive times. And the disciples of the Lord, His followers on earth, where are they? Most of them were frozen by the terror of the moment and are in the same impasse as the Disciples in the Garden of Gethsemane, unable to do anything. Burdened by the admission of their own weakness, they are wailing, crying, and indignant; they try to smite with a sword, but, now knowing how to handle weapons, cut the ear of Malchus the servant, and at the end, all run to hide from fear of the ruler or to deny any knowledge of this man, that is, they do not know the Church of Christ and are completely foreign to Her commandments and traditions.

"This is happening because those who have been called to represent the Lord are in the deep sleep of death, while His vineyard is left unattended, the fences are down, the diggers have started to ruin it, and the guards are asleep. The Apostle is calling us, to let us know that the time has come to wake up and chase away the diggers, to mend the fence around the vineyard, and then to confess loudly and without fear that the Church of the Lord is one, holy, venerable, and unblemished, like a bride adorned with all of Her teachings, institutions, and ancestral traditions. If we happen to encounter any resistance, we should come out to fight with an open heart, knowing that our weapon is the word of our Lord, Who, according to His unerring assurance, will be with us unto the end of the ages; in His hands lies the chance of our success when we fight for the Church and the truth.

"Christ died, but He resurrected with much more glory, and now He is among us and 'dieth no more; death had no more dominion over Him'."[245]

"For his opposition to the interference in Church affairs by the German occupying forces, [Archimandrite Galaction] was detained on January 18/31, 1917, by the German Central Police and interned as a hostage... This was the beginning of sufferings for the man who would become the founder of the Hierarchy of the Old Calendar Church of Romania. In a communiqué from the German Central Police, No. 10591, dated July 27, 1917 (New Style), he was accused of 'activity damaging to German interests, in blatant contradiction to his Apostolic mission, which renders impossible his reinstatement in the position that he has occupied until now.'"[246]

[245] Bujor, op. cit., pp. 30-32.
[246] Bujor, op. cit., p. 33.

27. THE PLOT

In September, 1915 a plot to overthrow the Russian State was hatched by a "Committee of National Salvation", which on September 8 issued "Disposition Number 1". "It affirmed that there were two wars going on in Russia – against a stubborn and skilful enemy from outside and a no less stubborn and skilful enemy from inside. The attainment of victory over the external enemy was unthinkable without a prior victory over the internal enemy. By the latter they had in mind the ruling dynasty. For victory on the internal front it was necessary… immediately to appoint a supreme command staff, whose basic core consisted of Prince G.E. Lvov, A.I. Guchkov and A.F. Kerensky."[247]

It was from these plotters that the core of the Provisional Government was eventually formed. But there were many others who helped by trying to undermine the resolve of the Tsar, whether or not they formed part of the formal conspiracy. Thus "before the February coup," writes Yana Sedova, "in the Russian empire there were more and more attempts on the part of individual people to 'open the eyes of his Majesty' to the internal political situation.

"This 'search for truth' assumed a particularly massive character in November, 1916, beginning on November 1, when Great Prince Nicholas Mikhailovich arrived at Stavka to have a heart-to-heart conversation with his Majesty…

"Very many considered it their duty to 'open the eyes of his Majesty': Great Princes Nicholas and Alexander Mikhailovich, Nicholas Nikolayevich and Paul Alexandrovich, the ministers Ignatiev and Pokrovsky, Generals Alexeyev and N.I. Ivanov, the ambassadors of allied governments Buchanan and Paléologue, the president of the Duma M. Rodzyanko, Protopresbyter of the army and navy G. Shavelsky, the court commandant V.N. Voejkov, the chief representative of the Red Cross P.M. Kaufmann-Turkestansky, the official A.A. Klopov, the dentist S.S. Kostritsky…

"This is far from a complete list. It includes only conversations, but many addressed his Majesty in letters or try to influence the Empress (Great Prince Alexander Mikhailovich both spoke with his Majesty and sent him a very long letter and spoke with the Empress). 'It seemed,' wrote Rodzyanko later, 'that the whole of Russia was beseeching his Majesty about one and the same thing, and it was impossible not to understand and pay heed to the pleas of a land worn out by suffering'.

"But what did 'the whole of Russia' ask about? As a rule, about two things: the removal of 'dark powers' and the bestowing of 'a ministry of confidence'. The degree to which the boundaries between these two groups was blurred is

[247] N. Yakovlev, *1 Avgusta, 1914,* Moscow, 1974, p. 13.

evident from the fact that the Duma deputy Protopopov at first considered himself a candidate for the 'ministry of confidence', but when his Majesty truly appointed him a minister, the name of Protopopov immediately appeared in the ranks of the 'dark powers'. By the 'dark powers' was usually understood Rasputin and his supposed protégés. Few began to think at that time that 'the Rasputin legend' was invented, and not invented in vain.

"It was less evident what the 'ministry of confidence' was. For many this term had a purely practical meaning and signified the removal from the government of certain ministers who were not pleasing to the Duma and the appointment in their place of Milyukov, Rodzyanko and other members of the Duma.

"But the closer it came to the February coup, the more demands there were in favour of a really responsible ministry, that is, a government which would be formed by the Duma and would only formally be confirmed by his Majesty. That a responsible ministry was no longer a real monarchy, but the end of the Autocracy was not understood by everyone. Nobody at that time listened to the words of Scheglovitov: 'A monarchist who goes with a demand for a ministry of public confidence is not a monarchist'.

"As for the idea of appointed people with no administrative experience, but of the Duma, to the government in conditions of war, this was evidently thought precisely by those people. All these arguments about 'dark forces' and 'a ministry of confidence' first arose in the Duma and were proclaimed from its tribune. Evidently the beginning of the mass movements towards his Majesty in November, 1916 were linked with the opening of a Duma session at precisely that time. These conversations were hardly time to coincide with the opening of the Duma: rather, they were elicited by the Duma speeches, which were distributed at the time not only on the pages of newspapers, but also in the form of leaflets. 'We,' wrote Shulgin later, 'ourselves went mad and made the whole country mad with the myth about certain geniuses, 'endowed with public confidence', when in fact there were none such…'

"In general, all these conversations were quite similar and usually irrelevant. Nevertheless, his Majesty always listened attentively to what was expressed in them, although by no means all his interlocutors were easy to listen to.

"Some of them, like many of the Great Princes and Rodzyanko, strove to impose their point of view and change his political course, demanding a ministry endowed with confidence or even a responsible ministry. His Majesty listened to them in silence and thanked them for their 'advice'.

"Others, like General Alexeyev or S.S. Kostritsky, were under the powerful impression (not to say influence) of the Duma speeches and political agitation, which the truly dark forces who had already thought up the February coup were conducting at the time. Those who gave regular reports to his Majesty

and whom he trusted were subjected to particularly strong pressure. If they began a heart-to-heart conversation, his Majesty patiently explained to them in what he did not agree with them and why.

"There existed a third category which, like P.M. Kaufmann, got through to his Majesty, even though they did not have a report to give, so as to tell him 'the whole bitter truth'. They did not clearly know what they wanted, and simply said 'everything that had built up in their souls'. Usually they began their speeches with the question: could they speak to him openly (as if his Majesty would say no to such a question!), and then spoke on the same two subjects, about the 'dark powers' and the government, insofar as, by the end of 1916, the same things, generally speaking, had built up in all their souls. The speech of such a 'truth-seeker' usually ended in such a sad way (Kaufmann just said: 'Allow me: I'll go and kill Grishka!') that his Majesty had to calm them down and assure them that 'everything will work out'.

"One cannot say that his Majesty did not listen to his interlocutors. Some ministers had to leave their posts precisely because of the conversations. For example, on November 9, 1916 his Majesty wrote to the Empress that he was sacking Shturmer since nobody trusted that minister: 'every day I hear more and more about him. We have to take account of that.' And on the same day he wrote in his diary: 'My head is tired from all these conversations'.

"By the beginning everyone noticed his tiredness, and his interlocutors began more often to foretell revolution to him. If earlier he could say to the visitor: 'But you've gone out of your mind, this is all in your dreams. And when did you dream it? Almost on the very eve of our victory?! And what are you frightened of? The rumours of corrupt Petersburg and the babblers in the Duma, who value, not Russia, but their own interests?' (from the memoirs of Mamantov) and the conversation came to an end – now he had to reply to the most senseless attacks. And he replied. To the rumours of betrayal in the entourage of the Empress: 'What, in your opinion I'm a traitor?' To the diagnosis made by the Duma about Protopopov: 'When did he begin to go mad? When I appointed him a minister?' To the demand 'to deserve the confidence of the people': 'But is it not that my people has to deserve my confidence?' However, they did not listen to him…

"Of course, they all saw that these conversations did not go down easily with his Majesty, especially if he had more than one in a day, as happened on February 10, 1917. However, the conversations continued. All this could not have a good influence on the Emperor: after all, his subjects repeated to him that he was mistaken, that there was no way of avoiding revolution. Not in vain, on March 2, when all the army commanders demanded his abdication, did his Majesty say that 'he does not want to hinder anyone'. And before this he had one more very important (although not the last) conversation, an argument even with General Ruzsky, who demanded that the Tsar agreed to accept the formula, 'The king reigns, but the government rules', and the Emperor was forced to explain to him the bases of monarchical power. 'I am

responsible before God and Russia for everything that has happened and will happen', said his Majesty. 'It doesn't matter whether there will be ministers responsible before the Duma and the State Council. I will never be in the situation when, seeing that what is being done by the ministers is not for the good of Russia, I can agree with them, comforting myself with the thought that the matter is not my concern, it is not my responsibility…'"[248]

Meanwhile, on February 14, 1917 Kerensky declared at a session of the State Duma: "The historical task of the Russian people at the present time is the task of annihilating the medieval regime immediately, at whatever cost… How is it possible to fight by lawful means against those whom the law itself has turned into a weapon of mockery against the people?... There is only one way with the violators of the law – their physical removal."[249]

And yet there were still those who saw clearly that the future of the Church and of Russia depended on the survival of the Autocracy. Thus members of the Yekaterinoslav section of the Union of the Russian People, headed by their president, Obraztsov, wrote to the chancellery of the Over-Procurator on February 23: "The gates of hell will not prevail over the Church of Christ, but the destiny of Orthodoxy in our fatherland is indissolubly bound up with the destiny of the Tsarist Autocracy. Remembering on the Sunday of Orthodoxy the merits of the Russian Hierarchs before the Church and the State, we in a filial spirit dare to turn to your Eminence and other first-hierarchs of the Russian Church: by your unanimous blessings and counsels in the spirit of peace and love, strengthen his Most Autocratic Majesty to defend the Sacred rights of the Autocracy, entrusted to him by God through the voice of the people and the blessing of the Church, against which those same rebels who are encroaching against our Holy Orthodox Church are now encroaching."[250]

But the leaders of the Church did not respond to this appeal. And it was this failure of the Church to support the Tsar in the moment of his greatest need that, more than any other single factor, doomed Russia to subjection to the rule of the Antichrist…

---

[248] Sedova, "'Razgovory po dusham' Fevral'skikh Impotentov" ('Heart-to-heart Conversation of the February Impotents'), *Nasha Strana* (Our Country), N 2834, December 29, 2007, p. 7.
[249] *Voprosy Istorii* (Questions of History), 1990, N 10, p. 144.
[250] *Pravoslavnij Tsar-Muchenik (The Orthodox Tsar-Martyr)*, Moscow: Orthodox Pilgrim, 1997, p. 771.

28. THE ABDICATION OF THE TSAR

"Terrible and mysterious," wrote Metropolitan Anastasy, second leader of the Russian Church Abroad, "is the dark visage of the revolution. Viewed from the vantage point of its inner essence, it is not contained within the framework of history and cannot be studied on the same level as other historical facts. In its deepest roots it transcends the boundaries of space and time, as was determined by Gustave le Bon, who considered it an irrational phenomenon in which certain mystical, supernatural powers were at work. But what before may have been considered dubious became completely obvious after the Russian Revolution. In it everyone sensed, as one contemporary writer expressed himself, the critical incarnation of absolute evil in the temper of man; in other words, the participation of the devil – that father of lies and ancient enemy of God, who tries to make man his obedient weapon against God – was clearly revealed."[251]

The event that triggered the revolution was the abdication of Tsar Nicholas. "For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work," says St. Paul; "only he who now restrains it will do so until he is out of the way" (II Thessalonians 2.7). Since "he who restrains", according to the interpretation of St. John Chrysostom and the Holy Fathers, is lawful monarchical power, the removal of that power must usher in "the mystery of lawlessness", the revolution.

On February 21, a 14-year-old Kievan novice, Olga Zosimovna Boiko, fell into a deep trance which lasted for exactly forty days and during which many mysteries were revealed to her. One of these was the coming abdication of the Tsar. And she saw the following: "In blinding light on an indescribably wonderful throne sat the Saviour, and next to Him on His right hand – our sovereign, surrounded by angels. His Majesty was in full royal regalia: a radiant white robe, a crown, with a sceptre in his hand. And I heard the martyrs talking amongst themselves, rejoicing that the last times had come and that their number would be increased.

"They said that they would be tormented for the name of Christ and for refusing to accept the seal [of the Antichrist], and that the churches and monasteries would soon be destroyed, and those living in the monasteries would be driven out, and that not only the clergy and monastics would be tortured, but also all those who did not want to receive 'the seal' and would stand for the name of Christ, for the Faith and the Church."[252]

The abdication of Tsar Nicholas on March 2, 1917 (old style) was the single most important event in modern history; its consequences are still

---

[251] Metropolitan Anastasius, *Besedy so svoim sobstvennym serdtsem* (Conversations with my own Heart), Jordanville, 1948, p. 123.

[252] Letter of Sergius Nilus to Hierodeacon Zosimas, 6 August, 1917; in Gubanov, op. cit., p. 121.

reverberating to the present day. And yet it remains in many ways shrouded in mystery.

For there is no consensus on several critical questions raised by it, such as: Did the Tsar in fact abdicate? Did he have the right to abdicate? Was he right to abdicate?

In the months leading up to the abdication, as we have seen, the Tsar was put under increasing pressure by the political and military leaders of Russia. They were convinced that his abdication in favour of a government "responsible to the people", i.e. a constitutional monarchy or parliamentary democracy, would bring peace and prosperity to the country. But Nicholas, with his deeper knowledge of God's ways and his country's needs, was doubtful, repeatedly asking: "Are you confident that my abdication will save Russia from bloodshed?"

They reassured him that it would. But the Tsar knew the quality of the men who were advising him. As he sadly wrote in his diary on the day of his abdication: "All around me I see cowardice, baseness and treason."[253] And again, on the same day, while holding a bundle of telegrams from the Corps of Generals and even from his own uncle, he said: "What is left for me to do when everyone has betrayed me?"

And indeed, there was very little he could do. He could probably continue to defy the will of the social and political élite, as he had done more than once in the past. But could he defy the will of his generals?[254] Perhaps he could count on the support of some military units. But the result would undoubtedly be a civil war, whose outcome was doubtful, but whose effect on the war with Germany could not be doubted: it would undoubtedly give the Germans a decisive advantage at a critical moment when Russia was just preparing for a spring offensive.

---

[253] "My abdication is necessary. Ruzsky transmitted this conversation [with Rodzianko] to the Staff HQ, and Alexeev to all the commanders-in-chief of the fronts. The replies from all arrived at 2:05. The essence is that that for the sake of the salvation of Russia and keeping the army at the front quiet, I must resolve on this step. I agreed. From the Staff HQ they sent the draft of a manifesto. In the evening from Petrograd Guchkov and Shulgin arrived, with whom I discussed and transmitted to them the signed and edited manifesto. At one in the morning I left Pskov greatly affected by all that had come to pass. All around me I see treason, cowardice, and deceit." (*Dnevniki Imperatora Nikolaia II* (The Diaries of Emperor Nicholas II), Moscow, 1992, p. 625)

[254] E.E. Alferev writes: "Factually speaking, in view of the position taken by [Generals] Ruzsky and Alexeev, the possibility of resistance was excluded. Being cut off from the external world, the Sovereign was as it were in captivity. His orders were not carried out, the telegrams of those who remained faithful to their oath of allegiance were not communicated to him. The Empress, who had never trusted Ruzsky, on learning that the Tsar's train had been help up at Pskov, immediately understood the danger. On March 2 she wrote to his Majesty: 'But you are alone, you don't have the army with you, you are caught like a mouse in a trap. What can you do?' (*Imperator Nikolaj II kak chelovek sil'noj voli* (Emperor Nicholas II as a Man of Strong Will), Jordanville, N.Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1983, 2004, p. 121).

This last factor was decisive: the Tsar would not contemplate undermining the war effort for any reason. For the first duty of an Orthodox Tsar after the defence of the Orthodox faith is the defence of the country against external enemies. And so, after an entire night spent in prayer, he laid aside the crown for his country's sake.

For, as he wrote: "I am ready to give up both throne and life if I should become a hindrance to the happiness of the homeland." And again he said: "There is no sacrifice that I would not make for the real benefit of Russia and for her salvation."

He informed the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Alexeev by telegram: "During the days of the great struggle against the external foe which, in the space of almost three years, has been striving to enslave our Native Land, it has pleased the Lord God to send down upon Russia a new and difficult trial. The national disturbances that have begun within the country threaten to reflect disastrously upon the further conduct of the stubborn war. The fate of Russia, the honour of our heroic army, the well-being of the people, the entire future of our precious Fatherland demand that the war be carried out to a victorious conclusion, come what may. The cruel foe is exerting what remains of his strength, and nor far distant is the hour when our valiant army with our glorious allies will be able to break the foe completely. In these decisive days in the life of Russia, We have considered it a duty of conscience to make it easy for Our people to bring about a tight-knit union and cohesion of all our national strength, in order that victory might be the more quickly attained, and, in agreement with the State Duma We have concluded that it would be a good thing to abdicate the Throne of the Russian State and to remove Supreme Power from Ourselves. Not desiring to be separated from Our beloved Son, We transfer Our legacy to Our Brother Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich, and bless Him to ascend the Throne of the Russian State. We command Our Brother to conduct State affairs fully and in inviolable unity with the representatives of those men who hold legislative office, upon those principles which they shall establish, swearing an inviolable oath to that effect. In the name of our ardently beloved Native Land We call upon all faithful sons of the Fatherland to fulfil their sacred duty before it, by submitting to the Tsar during the difficult moment of universal trials, and, aiding Him, together with the representatives of he people, to lead the Russian State out upon the path of victory, well-being and glory. May the Lord God help Russia. Pskov. 2 March, 15.00 hours. 1917. Nicholas." [255]

It has been argued that the telegram was not an abdication, but a final coded appeal to the army to support him. But such a supposition cannot be reconciled with the plain meaning of the text. And since all agree on the

[255] All dates are given according to the Old, Julian calendar then in use in Russia. Dates will be given in the new, Gregorian calendar after the introduction of that calendar by the Bolsheviks in January, 1918.

crystal-clear sincerity of Nicholas' character, there is no reason not to believe it.

It has also been argued that the "abdication" had no legal force because there was no provision for abdication in the Fundamental Laws. Thus, as Michael Nazarov points out, the Basic Laws of the Russian Empire, which had been drawn up by Tsar Paul I and which all members of the Royal Family swore to uphold, "do not foresee the abdication of a reigning Emperor ('from a religious… point of view the abdication of the Monarch, the Anointed of God, is contrary to the act of His Sacred Coronation and Anointing; it would be possible only by means of monastic tonsure' [N. Korevo]). Still less did his Majesty have the right to abdicate for his son in favour of his brother; while his brother Michael Alexandrovich had the right neither to ascend the Throne during the lifetime of the adolescent Tsarevich Alexis, nor to be crowned, since he was married to a divorced woman, nor to transfer power to the Provisional government, or refer the resolution of the question of the fate of the monarchy to the future Constituent Assembly.

"Even if the monarch had been installed by the will of such an Assembly, 'this would have been the abolition of the Orthodox legitimating principle of the Basic Laws', so that these acts would have been 'juridically non-existent', says Zyzykin (in this Korevo agrees with him). 'Great Prince Michael Alexandrovich… performed only an act in which he expressed his personal opinions and abdication, which had an obligatory force for nobody. Thereby he estranged himself from the succession in accordance with the Basic Laws, which juridically in his eyes did not exist, in spite of the fact that he had earlier, in his capacity as Great Prince on the day of his coming of age, sworn allegiance to the decrees of the Basic Laws on the inheritance of the Throne and the order of the Family Institution'.

"It goes without saying that his Majesty did not expect such a step from his brother, a step which placed the very monarchical order under question…"[256]

On the other hand, Archpriest John Vostorgov considered the transfer of power lawful: "Our former Emperor, who has abdicated from the throne, transferred power in a lawful manner to his brother. In his turn the brother of the Emperor, having abdicated from power until the final decision of the Constituent Assembly, in the same lawful manner transferred power to the Provisional Government, and to that permanent government that which be given to Russia by the Constituent Assembly. And so we now have a completely lawful Provisional Government which is the powers that be, as the

[256] Nazarov, *Kto naslednik rossijskogo prestola?* (Who is the Heir of the Russian Throne?), Moscow: "Russkaia Idea", 1996, p. 68). In defence of Great Prince Michael, it should be pointed out that he, too, acted under duress. As Nazarov points out, "Great Prince Mikhail Alexandrovich also acted under duress, under the pressure of the plotters who came to his house. Kerensky admitted that this had been their aim: 'We decided to surround the act of abdication of Mikhail Alexandrovich with every guarantee, but in such a way as to give the abdication a voluntary character'" (p. 69).

Word of God calls it. To this power, which is now the One Supreme and All-Russian power, we are obliged to submit in accordance with the duty of religious conscience; we are obliged to pray for it; we are obliged also to obey the local authorities established by it. In this obedience, after the abdication of the former Emperor and his brother, and after their indications that the Provisional Government is lawful, there can be no betrayal of the former oath, but in it consists our direct duty."[257]

And yet confusion and searching of consciences continued. Thus on July 24, some Orthodox Christians wrote to the Holy Synod "ardently beseeching" them "to explain to us in the newspaper *Russkoe Slovo* what... the oath given to us to be faithful to the Tsar, Nicholas Alexandrovich, means. People are saying in our area that if this oath is worth nothing, then the new oath to the new Tsar [the Provisional Government?] will be worth nothing. Which oath must be more pleasing to God. The first or the second? Because the Tsar is not dead, but is alive and in prison…"[258]

M.A. Babkin points out that Great Prince Michael's statement contained the sentences: "I made the firm decision to accept supreme power only if that would be the will of our great people, to whom it belongs in the Constituent Assembly to establish the form of government and the new basic laws of the Russian State. Therefore I ask all citizens of the Russian Realm to submit to the Provisional Government until the Constituent Assembly by its decision on the form of government shall express the will of the people".

"We can see," continues Babkin, "that the talk was not about the Great Prince's abdication from the throne, but about the impossibility of his occupying the royal throne without the clearly expressed acceptance of this by the whole people of Russia. Michael Alexandrovich presented the choice of the form of State government (in the first place – between people power and the monarchy) to the Constituent Assembly. Until the convening of the Constituent Assembly he entrusted the administration of the country to the Provisional Government 'which arose on the initiative of the State Duma'."[259]

Since Great Prince Michael had presented the choice of the form of State government to the Constituent Assembly, many firm opponents of the revolution – for example, Hieromartyr Andronicus, Archbishop of Perm – were prepared to accept the Provisional Government on the grounds that it was just that – provisional. They were not to know that the Constituent Assembly would hardly be convened before it would be dissolved by the Bolsheviks, and therefore that the monarchical order had come to an end. So

---

[257] Quoted in Tamara Groyan, Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow, *Tsariu Nebesnomu i Zemnomu Vernij* (Faithful to the Heavenly and Earthly Tsar), Moscow: Palomnik, 1996, p. 128.
[258] In Groyan, op. cit., pp. 122, 123.
[259] Babkin, "Sviatejshij Sinod Pravoslavnoj Rossijskoj Tserkvi i Revoliutsionnie Sobytia Fevralia-Marta 1917 g." ("The Most Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Revolutionary Events of February-March, 1917"), http://www.monarhist-spb.narod.ru/D-ST/Babkin-1, p. 3.

the results of the Tsar's abdication for Russia were different from what he had hoped and believed. Instead of an orderly transfer of power from one member of the royal family to another, Great-Prince Michael also abdicated, the Constituent Assembly was not convened, and the whole dynasty and autocratic order collapsed. And instead of preventing civil war for the sake of victory in the world war, the abdication was followed by defeat in the world war and the bloodiest civil war in history, followed by unprecedented sufferings and persecutions of the faith for generations.

Indeed, in retrospect we can see that this act brought to an end to the 1600-year period of the Orthodox Christian Empire that began with St. Constantine the Great. "He who restrains" the coming of the Antichrist, the Orthodox Christian Emperor, "was removed from the midst" (II Thessalonians 2.7) – and very soon "the collective Antichrist", Soviet power, began its savage torture of the Body of Holy Russia. St. John of Kronstadt had said that Russia without the Tsar would no longer even bear the name of Russia, and would be "a stinking corpse". And so it proved to be…

So was the Tsar right to abdicate, if there was no provision for such an act in law and if the results of his decision were so catastrophic for Russia?

The saints were ambiguous in their utterances. Thus Blessed Pasha of Sarov, who had foretold his destiny at the glorification of St. Seraphim, said: "Your Majesty, descend from the throne yourself".[260] But Blessed Duniushka of Ussuruisk said: "The Tsar will leave the nation, which shouldn't be, but this has been foretold to him from Above. This is his destiny. There is no way that he can evade it."[261] And another great eldress, Blessed Matrona of Moscow (+1952), said: "In vain did Emperor Nicholas renounce the throne, he shouldn't have done that. They forced him to do it. He was sorry for the people, and paid the price himself, knowing his path beforehand."[262]

[260] Gubanov, op. cit., p. 70.
[261] http://www.geocities.com/kitezhgrad/prophets/duniushka.html.
[262] In Gubanov, op. cit., p. 62.

29. THE CHURCH AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION

One might have expected the Church authorities to throw light on this question by coming out for or against the abdication. However, the Synod showed itself to be at a loss at this critical moment. At its session of February 26 (old style), it refused the request of the Assistant Procurator, Prince N.D. Zhevakhov, that the creators of disturbances should be threatened with ecclesiastical punishments.[263] Then, on February 27, it refused the request of the Over-Procurator, N.P. Raev, that it publicly support the monarchy. Ironically, therefore, that much-criticised creation of Peter the Great, the office of Over-Procurator, proved more faithful to the Anointed of God at this critical moment than the Church leadership itself…

"On March 2," writes M.A. Babkin, "the Synodal hierarchs gathered in the residence of the Metropolitan of Moscow. They listened to a report given by Metropolitan Pitirim of St. Petersburg asking that he be retired (this request was agreed to on March 6 – M.B.). The administration of the capital's diocese was temporarily laid upon Bishop Benjamin of Gdov. But then the members of the Synod recognized that it was necessary immediately to enter into relations with the Executive committee of the State Duma. On the basis of which we can assert that the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church recognized the Provisional Government even before the abdication of Nicholas II from the throne. (The next meeting of the members of the Synod took place on March 3 in the residence of the Metropolitan of Kiev. On that same day the new government was told of the resolutions of the Synod.)

"The first triumphantly official session of the Holy Synod after the coup d'état took place on March 4. Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev presided and the new Synodal over-procurator, V.N. Lvov, who had been appointed by the Provisional government the previous day, was present. Metropolitan Vladimir and the members of the Synod (with the exception of Metropolitan Pitirim, who was absent – M.B.) expressed their sincere joy at the coming of a new era in the life of the Orthodox Church. And then at the initiative of the over-procurator the royal chair… was removed into the archives… One of the Church hierarchs helped him. It was decided to put the chair into a museum.

"The next day, March 5, the Synod ordered that in all the churches of the Petrograd diocese the Many Years to the Royal House 'should no longer be proclaimed'. In our opinion, these actions of the Synod had a symbolical character and witnessed to the desire of its members 'to put into a museum' not only the chair of the Tsar, but also 'to despatch to the archives' of history royal power itself.

"The Synod reacted neutrally to the 'Act on the abdication of Nicholas II from the Throne of the State of Russia for himself and his son in favour of

[263] A.D. Stepanov, "Mezhdu mirom i monastyrem" ("Between the World and the Monastery"), in *Tajna Bezzakonia* (The Mystery of Iniquity), St. Petersburg, 2002, p. 491.

Great Prince Michael Alexandrovich' of March 2, 1917 and to the 'Act on the refusal of Great Prince Michael Alexandrovich to accept supreme power' of March 3. On March 6 it resolved to accept these acts 'for information and execution', and that in all the churches of the empire molebens should be served with a Many Years 'to the God-preserved Russian Realm and the Right-believing Provisional Government'."[264]

But was the new government, whose leading members, as we have seen, were Masons, really "right-believing"? The foreign minister of the new government, Paul Milyukov, when asked who had elected his government, had replied: "The Russian revolution elected us".[265] But the revolution cannot be lawful, being the incarnation of lawlessness. How, then, could the Church allow her members to vote for Masonic or social-democratic delegates to the Constituent Assembly? After all, that Assembly would determine the future form of government of the Russian land. Why had the Church so quickly renounced Tsarism, which had formed one of the pillars of Russian identity for nearly 1000 years?

The hierarch who took perhaps the most uncompromising stand on this question was the future Hieromartyr, Archbishop Andronicus of Perm. On March 4, in an address "To All Russian Orthodox Christians", he called the present situation an "interregnum". Calling on all to obey the Provisional Government, he said: "We shall beseech the All-Generous One that He Himself establish authority and peace on our land, that He not abandon us for long without a Tsar, as children without a mother. May He help us, as three hundred years ago He helped our ancestors, that we may unanimously and with inspiration receive a native Tsar from His All-Good Providence."

The new over-procurator wrote to Andronicus demanding an explanation for his actions in support of the old regime, which "aimed at the setting up of the clergy against the new order". The correspondence between them culminated on April 16 with a detailed letter from Archbishop Andronicus, in which he said: "The act on the refusal of Michael Alexandrovich which legitimises the Provisional Government declared that after the Constituent Assembly we could have a monarchical government, or any other, depending on how the Constituent Assembly will pronounce on this. I have submitted to the Provisional Government, I will also submit to a republic if it will be established by the Constituent Assembly. But until then not one citizen is deprived of the freedom of expressing himself on the form of government for Russia; otherwise a Constituent Assembly would be superfluous if someone could irrevocably predetermine the question on the form of government in Russia. As I have already said many times, I have submitted to the Provisional Government, I submit now and I call on all to submit. I am perplexed on what basis you find it necessary to accuse me 'of inciting the

[264] Babkin, op. cit., pp. 2, 3.
[265] Quoted in G.M. Katkov, *Fevral'skaia Revoliutsia* (The February Revolution), Paris: YMCA Press, 1984, p. 370.

people not only against the Provisional Government, but also against the spiritual authorities generally'".[266]

A similar position was taken by Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) of Kharkov, who on March 5, at the end of the liturgy, declared: "When we received news of the abdication from the throne of His Most Pious Emperor Nicholas Alexandrovich, we prepared, in accordance with his instructions, to commemorate His Most Pious Emperor Michael Alexandrovich. But now he too has abdicated, and commanded that we should obey the Provisional Government, and for that reason, and only for that reason, we are commemorating the Provisional Government. Otherwise no power could force us to cease the commemoration of the Tsar and the Royal Family… We must do this, first, in fulfilment of the oath given by us to His Majesty Nicholas II, who transferred power to Prince Michael Alexandrovich, who handed this power over to the Provisional Government until the Constituent Assembly. Secondly, we must do this so as to avoid complete anarchy, larceny, fighting and sacrilege against the holy things. Only in one must we listen to nobody, neither now nor in the past, neither tsars nor rulers nor the mob: if they demand that we renounce the faith, or defile the holy things, or in general carry out clearly lawless and sinful acts."[267]

However, with the exception of a very few such as these, the Church could not be said to have been on the Tsar's side. Thus on March 7 the "conservative" Archbishop Seraphim (Chichagov) of Tver and Kashin appeared to welcome the change of regime: "By the mercy of God, the popular uprising against the old, wretched order in the State, which led Russia to the edge of destruction in the harsh years of world war, has taken place without many victims, and Russia has easily passed to the new State order, thanks to the firm decision of the State Duma, which formed the Provisional Government, and the Soviet of workers' deputies. The Russian revolution has turned out to be almost the shortest and most bloodless of all revolutions that history has known…"[268]

On March 9, the Holy Synod addressed all the children of the Orthodox Russian Church, beginning with the fateful words: "The will of God has been accomplished. Russia has entered on the path of a new State life. May God bless our great Homeland with happiness and glory on its new path. Trust the Provisional Government. All together and everyone individually, apply all

---

[266] Babkin, op. cit., p. 8.

[267] Archbishop Anthony, *Pastyr' i Pastva* (Pastor and Flock), 1917, □ 10, pp. 280-281; *Pis'ma Blazhenneishago Mitropolita Antonia (Khrapovitskago)* (The Letters of his Beatitude Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), Jordanville, 1988, p. 57; Monk Benjamin (Gomareteli), *Letopis' tserkovnykh sobytij Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi nachinaia s 1917 goda* (Chronicle of Church Events, beginning from 1917), www.zlatoust.ws/letopis.htm, pp. 2-3. Cf. Victor Antonov, "1917 god: Arkhiepiskop Antonij i Fevralisty" (1917: Archbishop Anthony and the Februarists), *Vozvrashchenie* (Return), N 2 (6), 1994, p. 25.

[268] Archbishop Seraphim, *Tverskie Eparkhial'nie Vedomosti* (Tver Diocesan Gazette), 1917, NN 9-10, pp. 75-76; in Monk Benjamin, op. cit., p. 4.

your efforts to the end that by your labours, exploits, prayer and obedience you may help it in its great work of introducing new principles of State life…"

Now it is understandable that the Synod would not want to risk a civil war by displaying opposition to the new government. But was it true that "the will of God has been accomplished"? Was it not rather that God had allowed the will of *Satan* to be accomplished, as a punishment for the sins of the Russian people? And if so, how could the path be called a "great work"?

Babkin writes: "This epistle was characterised by B.V. Titlinov, professor of the Petrograd Theological Academy, as 'an epistle blessing a new and free Russia', and by General A.I. Denikin as 'sanctioning the coup d'état that has taken place'. To the epistle were affixed the signatures of the bishops of the 'tsarist' composition of the Synod, even those who had the reputation of being monarchists and 'black hundredists', for example, Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev and Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow. This witnessed to the 'loyal' feelings of the Synodal hierarchs…"[269]

Other hierarchs echoed the words of the Address in still more revolutionary tones. Thus Bishop Andrew of Ufa wrote: "The abdication from the throne of Nicholas II frees his former subjects from their oath to him. But besides this, every Orthodox Christian must remember the words of one Church song, that 'if thou hast sworn, but not for the good, it is better for thee to break thine oath' than to do evil (from the service on the day of the Beheading of John the Forerunner). I wrote about this in *Thoughts on February 9, 1916,* when I pointed to the great church-civil exploit of Metropolitan Philip of Moscow, who found in his conscience support for his rebuking the iniquities of the Terrible one. And so the question of the oath for those who have been disturbed and are weak in conscience completely falls away.

"… The Autocracy of the Russian tsars degenerated first into absolutism [samovlastie] and then into despotism [svoevlastie] exceeding all probability… And lo! their power has collapsed – the power that turned away from the Church. The will of God has been accomplished… The Catholic Church of Christ has been delivered from the oppression of the State."[270]

The Council of the Petrograd religious-philosophical society went still further, demanding the removal not only of the Tsar, but also of the very concept of Sacred Monarchy. Thus in its sessions of March 11 and 12, the Council resolved that the Synod's acceptance of the Tsar's abdication "does not correspond to the enormous religious importance of the act, by which the Church recognized the Tsar in the rite of the coronation of the anointed of God. It is necessary, for the liberation of the people's conscience and to avoid

[269] Babkin, op. cit., pp. 3-4; Oleg Lebedev, "Mezhdu Fevraliem i Oktiabrem" ("Between February and October), *Nezavisimaia Gazeta* (The Independent Newspaper), 13 November, 1996, p. 5).
[270] Archbishop Andrew, *Ufimskie Vedomosti* (Ufa Gazette), 1917, NN 5-6, pp. 138-139; Monk Benjamin, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

the possibility of a restoration, that a corresponding act be issued in the name of the Church hierarchy *abolishing the power of the Sacrament of Royal Anointing, by analogy with the church acts abolishing the power of the Sacraments of Marriage and the Priesthood."*[271]

If the Church hierarchy, traditionally the main support of the Autocracy, faltered, it is not surprising that the people as a whole faltered, too… The Tsar *was* alone. And since the leadership of a Christian State must be dual – through a partnership or "symphony" of Church and State – he could not continue to rule as an Orthodox Christian tsar. Just as it takes two to make a marriage, so it takes two powers to make a Christian state. The bridegroom in this case was willing and worthy, but the bride was not. In Deuteronomy 17.14 the Lord had laid it down as one of the conditions of the creation of a God-pleasing monarchy that the people should *want* a God-pleasing king.[272] The Russian people did not want their pious Tsar. And so the Scripture was fulfilled: "We have no king, because we feared not the Lord" (Hosea 10.3).

As P.S. Lopukhin wrote: "At the moment of his abdication his Majesty felt himself to be profoundly alone, and around him was 'cowardice, baseness and treason'. And to the question how he could have abdicated from his tsarist service, it is necessary to reply: he did this because we abdicated from his tsarist service, from his sacred and sanctified authority…"[273]

And yet in a real sense the Tsar saved the monarchy for the future by his abdication. For in abdicating he resisted the temptation to apply force and start a civil war in a cause that was just from a purely juridical point of view, but which could not be justified from a deeper, eschatological point of view. (Compare the words of the Prophet Shemaiah to King Rehoboam and the house of Judah as they prepared to face the house of Israel: "Thus saith the Lord, Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren, the children of Israel. Return every man to his house…" (I Kings 12.24)).

The Tsar-Martyr resisted the temptation to act like a Western absolutist ruler, thereby refuting those in both East and West who looked on his rule as just that – a form of absolutism. He showed that the Orthodox Autocracy was not a form of absolutism, but something completely sui generis – the external aspect of the self-government of the Orthodox Church and people on earth. He refused to treat his power as if it were *independent of* the Church and

---

[271] Groyan, op. cit., p. 142. Italics mine (V.M.).

[272] As Lev Tikhomirov writes: "Without establishing a kingdom, Moses foresaw it and pointed it out in advance to Israel... It was precisely Moses who pointed out in advance the two conditions for the emergence of monarchical power: it was necessary, first, that the people itself should recognize its necessity, and secondly, that the people itself should not elect the king over itself, but should present this to the Lord. Moreover, Moses indicated a leadership for the king himself: 'when he shall sit upon the throne of his kingdom, he must… fulfil all the words of this law'." (*Monarkhicheskaia Gosudarstvennost* (Monarchical Statehood), Buenos Aires, 1968, pp. 127-129).

[273] Lopukhin, "Tsar' i Patriarkh" (Tsar and Patriarch), *Pravoslavnij Put'* (The Orthodox Way), 1951, pp. 103-104.

people, but showed that it was a form of *service to* the Church and the people *from within* the Church and the people, in accordance with the word: "I have raised up one chosen out of My people… with My holy oil have I anointed him" (Psalm 88.18, 19). So not "government by the people and for the people" in a democratic sense, but "government by one chosen out of the people of God for the people of God and responsible to God alone"…

30. THREE VISIONS OF 1917

In demonstrating this understanding of the Orthodox Autocracy in the whole manner of his self-sacrificial life, the Tsar actually preserved the ideal of the Orthodox Autocracy for future generations, handing it over "for safe-keeping", as it were, to God and His Most Holy Mother. For on the very day of his abdication, the Mother of God appeared to the peasant woman Eudocia Adrianovna and said to her: "Go to the village of Kolomenskoye; there you will find a big, black icon. Take it and make it beautiful, and let people pray in front of it." Eudocia found the icon at 3 o'clock, the precise hour of the abdication. Miraculously it renewed itself, and showed itself to be the "Reigning" icon of the Mother of God, the same that had led the Russian armies into war with Napoleon. On it she was depicted sitting on a royal throne dressed in a dark red robe and bearing the orb and sceptre of the Orthodox Tsars, as if to show that the sceptre of rule of the Russian land had passed from earthly rulers to the Queen of Heaven…[274]

We learn more about the significance of this icon from a revelation given in a series of dreams in 1917 to Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow, who alone in the Church's hierarchy had refused to accept the Provisional Government because of his oath of allegiance to the Tsar: "I saw a field. The Saviour was walking along a path. I went after Him, crying,

"'Lord, I am following you!'

"Finally we approached an immense arch adorned with stars. At the threshold of the arch the Saviour turned to me and said again:

"'Follow me!'

And He went into a wondrous garden, and I remained at the threshold and awoke. Soon I fell asleep again and saw myself standing in the same arch, and with the Saviour stood Tsar Nicholas. The Saviour said to the Tsar:

"'You see in My hands two cups: one which is bitter for your people and the other sweet for you.'

"The Tsar fell to his knees and for a long time begged the Lord to allow him to drink the bitter cup together with his people. The Lord did not agree for a long time, but the Tsar begged importunately. Then the Saviour drew out of the bitter cup a large glowing coal and laid it in the palm of the Tsar's hand. The Tsar began to move the coal from hand to hand and at the same time his body began to grow light, until it had become completely bright, like some

[274] It is said that during the siege of the Moscow Kremlin in October, 1917, the Mother of God ordered the "Reigning" icon to be taken in procession seven times round the Kremlin, and then it would be saved. However, it was taken round only once… (Monk Epiphany (Chernov), *Tserkov' Katakombnaia na Zemle Rossijskoj* (The Catacomb Church in the Russian Land), MS, Old Woking, 1980.

radiant spirit. At this I again woke up. Falling asleep yet again, I saw an immense field covered with flowers. In the middle of the field stood the Tsar, surrounded by a multitude of people, and with his hands he was distributing manna to them. An invisible voice said at this moment:

"'The Tsar has taken the guilt of the Russian people upon himself, and the Russian people is forgiven.'"

Many have doubted the idea that the Russian people could be forgiven through the Tsar. However, A.Ya. Yakovitsky has expressed the following interesting interpretation. The aim of the Provisional Government was to create the conditions for elections to the Constituent Assembly, which would finally have rejected the monarchical principle. But this would also have brought the anathema of the Zemsky Sobor upon the whole of Russia, because the anathema invoked a curse on the Russian land if it ever rejected the Romanov dynasty. Now the vision of Metropolitan Macarius, according to Yakovitsky, shows that through his martyric patience the Tsar obtained from the Lord that the Constituent Assembly should not come to pass – through the overthrow of the Provisional Government by the Bolsheviks in October, 1917. Moreover, his distributing manna to the people is a symbol of the distribution of the Holy Gifts of the Divine Liturgy. So the Church hierarchy, while it wavered in its loyalty in 1917, did not finally reject monarchism, and so did not come under anathema and was able to continue feeding the people spiritually. In this way the Tsar saved and redeemed his people.

Returning to the Reigning icon, Yakovitsky quotes S. Fomin on the significance of her blood-red robe: "The symbol of this icon is clear for spiritual eyes: through innumerable sufferings, blood and tears, and after repentance, the Russian people will be forgiven and Royal power, preserved by the Queen of Heaven herself, will undoubtedly be returned to Russia. Otherwise, why should the Most Holy Mother of God have preserved this Power?"[275]

"With this it is impossible to disagree," continues Yakovitsky. "The sin committed can be purified only by blood. But so that the very *possibility of* ***redemption*** should arise, some other people had to receive power over the people that had sinned, as Nebuchadnezzar received this power over the Jewish people (as witnessed by the Prophet Jeremiah), or Baty over the Russian people (the first to speak of this after the destruction was the council of bishops of the Kiev metropolia)… Otherwise, the sufferings caused by fraternal blood-letting would only deepen the wrath of God…"[276]

So redemption could be given to the Russian people only if they expiated their sin through the sufferings of martyrdom and repentance, and provided

[275] S. Fomin (ed.), *Rossia pered Vtorym Prishestviem* (Russian before the Second Coming), Moscow, 2003, p. 235.
[276] Yakovitsky, "Sergianstvo: mif ili real'nost'", *Vernost'* (Fidelity), N 100, January, 2008.

that they did not willingly, through a Constituent Assembly, reject the Orthodox Autocracy in principle. The Tsar-Martyr laid the foundation to this redemption by his petition before the throne of the Almighty. The New Martyrs built on this foundation through their martyric sufferings.

And yet redemption, as revealed in the restoration of the Orthodox Autocracy, has not yet come. And that because the third element – the repentance of the whole people – has not yet taken place. In the same fateful year of 1917 Elder Nectarius of Optina prophesied about this: "Now his Majesty is not his own man, he is suffering such humiliation for his mistakes. 1918 will be still worse. His Majesty and all his family will be killed, tortured. One pious girl had a vision: Jesus Christ was sitting on a throne, while around Him were the twelve apostles, and terrible torments and groans resounded from the earth. And the Apostle Peter asked Christ:

"'O Lord, when will these torments cease?'

"And Jesus Christ replied: 'I give them until 1922. If the people do not repent, do not come to their senses, then they will all perish in this way.'

"Then before the throne of God there stood our Tsar wearing the crown of a great-martyr. Yes, this tsar will be a great-martyr. Recently, he has redeemed his life, and if people do not turn to God, then not only Russia, but the whole of Europe will collapse..."

So when would the final redemption come? To Archbishop Theophan was revealed the answer through the Holy Elders of Valaam: "I do not speak from myself. But that which I have heard from the God-inspired elders, that I have passed on...

"The Lord will have mercy on Russia for the sake of the small remnant of true believers. In Russia, the elders said, in accordance with the will of the people, the Monarchy, Autocratic power, will be re-established. The Lord has forechosen the future Tsar. He will be a man of fiery faith, having the mind of a genius and a will of iron. First of all he will introduce order in the Orthodox Church, removing all the untrue, heretical and lukewarm hierarchs. And many, very many - with few exceptions, all - will be deposed, and new, true, unshakeable hierarchs will take their place. He will be of the family of the Romanovs according to the female line. Russia will be a powerful state, but only for 'a short time'... And then the Antichrist will come into the world, with all the horrors of the end as described in the Apocalypse."[277]

[277] Archbishop Theophan, in Richard Bettes, Vyacheslav Marchenko, *Dukhovnik Tsarskoj Sem'i (Spiritual Father of the Royal Family)*, Moscow: Valaam Society of America, 1994.